DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 182 852 EA 012 486

AUTHOR Hill, Richard: And Others
TITLE The Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education in North Dakota. "The FESEND Project." Technical Report Number Two.
INSTITUTION North Dakota Univ., Grand Forks. Bureau of Educational Research and Services.
PUB DATE Aug 79
NOTE 124p.: For related documents, see EA 012 484-487: Not available in paper copy due to marginal legibility of tables

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Accreditation (Institutions): *Administrator Attitudes: *Educational Finance: Elementary Secondary Education: *Expenditure Per Student: Finance Reform: *High School Curriculum: School Districts: School Redistricting: School Superintendents: School Surveys: *Special Education: Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS *North Dakota

ABSTRACT

This report, one of several companion reports to the publication entitled, "A General Report," is concerned with analysis of a study of school finance in North Dakota. It contains position papers, data, and data treatment on which the general report was based, covering the following topics: financing of elementary and secondary schools in North Dakota, interviews with school officials, longitudinal accreditation data, high school course offerings, reorganization and annexation of school districts, and financing special education. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED182852

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Torgeson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TECHNICAL REPORT NUMBER TWO

The Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education in North Dakota

"The FESEND Project"

by

Richard Hill, Director

Gerald Bass, Carl Carlson, Bruce Montplaisir
Gerald Roth, Gary Shaw, David Smette
Harry Weisenberger, Associates

Bureau of Educational Research and Services
University of North Dakota
Grand Forks, North Dakota

1979

A BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO

"TECHNICAL REPORT NUMBER TWO"

The FESEND project attempted to collect and analyze data thought useful in future deliberation of elementary and secondary educational finance policies in North Dakota.

A short monograph, "A General Report", was developed to present findings briefly and, hopefully, coherently. Discussion and conclusions were included in that general report.

Contained here, and in another "Technical Report", are the position papers, the tables, the data,and data treatments which were basic to the statements made in the general report.

There is little coherence to what is here aggregated. Still, the separate papers and especially the data themselves may be of considerable utility to the individual who wishes to press further than is permitted in the general monograph. Even this attempt cannot incorporate all data considered nor report all discussion or analysis undertaken. Several of the longer "position papers", some of the data, and virtually all of the material from other states and other projects used in analysis were <u>not</u> included in these reports.

TABLE OF CONTENTS AND TABLES

A BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO "TECHNICAL REPORT NUMBER TWO" iii

BACKGROUND MEMORANDUM ON THE FINANCING OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS . . . 1

HISTORY OF THE FOUNDATION PROGRAM 1

EQUALIZATION OF NONPROPERTY TAX REVENUES 5

HEW GRANT FOR STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL FINANCE 6

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 3037 7

INTERVIEWS WITH SCHOOL OFFICIALS 9

TABLE 1 The Quest for Equalization Was Desirable 10

TABLE 2 Increases in State Support for Transportation Were Desirable . . . 10

TABLE 3 Increasing the State's Share of the Financial Burden for Education Was Desirable 11

TABLE 4 Desirable Mix of State, Local, and Federal Support of Education 12

TABLE 5 Future State Responsibility for Transportation 13

TABLE 6a Opinions on the 20 Mill Equalization Factor 14

TABLE 6b Crosstabs Analysis - Table 1 Against Table 6a 15

TABLE 7 Continue to Use Cost Statistics as a Means for Determining Index Numbers and Payments 16

TABLE 8 Costs Should be Reviewed Each Biennium 16

TABLE 9 Cost Relationships Should be Reviewed Each Biennium 17

TABLE 10a Enrollment Pattern over Past 5 Years 18

TABLE 10b Enrollment Predicted over Next 5 Years 18

TABLE 11 Crosstabs Analysis - Table 10a Against School Size 19

TABLE 12 A Proper Part of the Foundation Program Is to Assist Districts Which Experience Declining Enrollment 19

TABLE 13 The Save Harmless Provision for Declining Enrollment Is Adequate 20

TABLE 14 Program Changes for Past Five Years 21

TABLE 15a Priority Rating to Add or Improve Courses or Programs in Grades 9-12 22

TABLE 15b Priority of Program Improvement for Future 22

TABLE 16a Priority Rating to Cut Courses or Programs in Grades 9-12 . . . 23

TABLE 16b Programs with Top Priority for Cutting 24

TABLE 17a Special Education Should be Funded Through the Foundation Program 24

TABLE 17b Vocational Education Should be Funded Through the Foundation Program 25

TABLE 17c Kindergarten Should be Funded Through the Foundation Program 25

TABLE 18 The "New" Foundation Program has Helped Accreditation 26

TABLE 19 The "New" Foundation Program Reduced Cash Flow Problems 27

TABLE 20 The "New" Foundation Program Increase Exceeded the Rate of Inflation 27

TABLE 21 The "New" Foundation Program Permitted Districts to Increase Salaries 28

TABLE 22 The Number of Funds for School Financing Should be Reduced by Combining 29

TABLE 23 The Foundation Program Should Distinguish Between Sparsity and Small by Local Option 29

TABLE 24 The Foundation Program Should Reimburse Schools Small Due to Sparsity 30

LONGITUDINAL FINANCIAL DATA 31

TABLE 1 Per Pupil Expenditure in 1-8 One-Room Rural Schools 33

TABLE 2 Per Pupil Expenditures in 1-6 High School and Graded Elementary Districts 35

TABLE 3 Per Pupil Expenditures in K-8 37

TABLE 4 Per Pupil Expenditures for Plant and Equipment Based on Average Daily Membership in High School Districts 39

TABLE 5 Per Pupil Expenditures in High School Districts for Grades 9-12 41

TABLE 6 Per Pupil Expenditures in High School Districts for Grades K-8 44

TABLE 7A Total Expense per Pupil 48

TABLE 7B Total Expense per Pupil 48

TRANSPORTATION COSTS 49

TABLE 1 Transportation Costs and Reimbursements, Adams County, 1976-77 49

TABLE 2 Transportation Costs and Reimbursements, Barnes County, 1976-77 50

LONGITUDINAL ACCREDITATION DATA 52

TABLE 1 Identification of Elementary School Accreditation Items 54

TABLE 2 Percentage of Elementary Schools in Compliance with Accreditation Criteria for the Years 1972 and 1976 55

TABLE 3 Percentage of Elementary Schools, Increase or Decrease, in Compliance with Accreditation Standards from 1972 to 1976 . . 56

TABLE 4 Percentage of Elementary Schools in High School Districts in Compliance with Accreditation Criteria, 1972-1976 57

TABLE 5 Percentage of Graded Elementary Schools in Compliance with Accreditation Criteria, 1972-1976 58

TABLE 6 Percentage of One-Room Rural Schools in Compliance with Accreditation Criteria, 1972-1976 59

TABLE 7 Identification of High School Accreditation Items 60

TABLE 8 Percentage of High Schools in Compliance with Accreditation Criteria by Size for the Years 1972 and 1976 61

TABLE 9 Percentage of High Schools in Compliance with Accreditation Criteria by Size, 1972 62

TABLE 10 Percentage of High Schools in Compliance with Accreditation Criteria by Size, 1973 63

TABLE 11 Percentage of High Schools in Compliance with Accreditation Criteria by Size, 1974 64

TABLE 12 Percentage of High Schools in Compliance with Accreditation Criteria by Size, 1975 65

TABLE 13 Percentage of High Schools in Compliance with Accreditation Criteria by Size, 1976 66

TABLE 14 Percentage of High Schools (Size 0-74) in Compliance with Accreditation Criteria, 1972-1976 67

TABLE 15 Percentage of High Schools (Size 75-149) in Compliance with Accreditation Criteria, 1972-1976 68

TABLE 16 Percentage of High Schools (Size 150-549) in Compliance with Accreditation Criteria, 1972-1976 69

TABLE 17 Percentage of High Schools (Size 550 and Larger) in Compliance with Accreditation Criteria, 1972-1976 70

COURSE OFFERINGS 71

TABLE 1 Course Offerings in North Dakota High School Districts (1972-73 through 1976-77) 72

REORGANIZATION AND ANNEXATION 84

TABLE 1 Number of Reorganizations of North Dakota School Districts 1967-68 to 1976-77 85

TABLE 2 Number of Annexations, Dissolutions, or Reorganizations Approved by the State Board of Public School Education (Involving More than Ten Sections of Land) 85

TABLE 3 Summary Data of Enrollments, Types and Numbers of School Districts, and Professional Personnel (1967-68 through 1976-77) 87

ISSUES IN FINANCING SPECIAL EDUCATION 89

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 95

SPECIAL EDUCATION INCIDENCES 96

TABLE 1 Percentage of School Population Provided with Special Education Service(s) 96

TABLE 2 Incidence of Handicapped Children, Fiscal Year 1976 98

TABLE 3 Speech Impaired: Unit or District Reported 99

TABLE 4 Mentally Retarded: Unit or District Reported 100

TABLE 5 Learning Disabled: Unit or District Reported 101

TABLE 6 Emotionally Disturbed: Unit or District Reported 102

TABLE 7 Orthopedically and Other Health Impaired: Unit or District Reported 103

TABLE 8 Hearing Impaired: Unit or District Reported 104

TABLE 9 Visually Impaired: Unit or District Reported 105

ANALYSIS OF A.F.D.C. INCIDENCES 106

TABLE 1 A.F.D.C. Students 1976-77 108

BACKGROUND MEMORANDUM ON THE

FINANCING OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS*

Committee Directives

House Concurrent Resolution No. 3037 directs the Legislative Council, with the assistance of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, to study the entire field of the financing of elementary and secondary schools in North Dakota, with emphasis on the Foundation Program, the effect of various tax sources on school districts, school transportation costs, costs of summer sessions and the relationship and impact of such programs on Foundation Program payments, and the methods of accounting and reporting used by the various schools and school districts. The study resolution calls special attention to the following areas of concern:

1. Population shifts and school district reorganization have resulted in major changes in the patterns of expenditures of public funds for elementary and secondary schools since the Foundation Program was created in 1959.

2. Changing times have resulted in changes in educational programs and curriculums, with increased emphasis on special programs, summer sessions, and transportation, all of which have resulted in the placing of a greater burden upon the educational dollar.

3. Recent court decisions have focused attention on the fact that the state has an obligation to provide an equal education opportunity for all students.

4. There is a need to study the financial effect on school districts of large industrial plants, both those subject to property taxes and those subject to taxes in lieu of property taxes, including a study of deductions from Foundation Program payments for taxes received from such plants and other sources of tax revenue.

House Concurrent Resolution No. 3037 includes a reference to a Department of Health, Education and Welfare grant which has been made available to the Superintendent of Public Instruction to study educational finance in North Dakota during the 1977-79 biennium.

HISTORY OF THE FOUNDATION PROGRAM
1959 - 1971

The Foundation Program for schools has been in effect since 1959. Although the state had provided assistance to local schools for more than 20 years prior to that year, it was the 1959 Legislative Session that first enacted a comprehensive program which included uniform minimum efforts at the local level. The legislation enacted in 1959 was the result of an interim study which found that the average cost of elementary education in North Dakota was $250 per year. The interim committee recommended that the state

---

*Prepared by the Legislative Council staff for the Committee on Education, June 1977

guarantee 60 percent of the statewide cost of education (or $150). This was accomplished by a county mill levy of 21 mills and a state appropriation to make up the difference. Recognizing that circumstances varied in different school districts and that some higher cost schools in the state "must continue to operate regardless of future school district reorganization plans" the 1959 Legislative Assembly incorporated a system of weighting the payments to favor schools with lower enrollments and higher costs. The 1959 law also recognized the higher costs for high schools and provided a higher weighting factor for them.

1971 - 1973

The Foundation Program remained virtually unchanged from 1959 until 1973. During the 1969-71 interim, a crisis was developing in school finance and a special Legislative Council Committee on Educational Finance was created. This committee recommended a bill to require each school district to have deducted from its county equalization fund payment a sum equal to what would be raised by a 34-mill levy in a high school district or a 22-mill levy in an elementary district. There would also have been substantial increases in the amount of state aid. Personal property tax payback moneys earmarked for school districts would have been paid through the Foundation Program instead of through the personal property replacement formula. This proposal became known as the "fair-share" bill and was defeated by the 1971 Legislative Session. However, during the 1971-73 interim many school districts were still in financial difficulties and the chairman of the Legislative Council directed the interim Committee on Education to conduct a comprehensive study of educational finance in North Dakota.

As a result of the interim study, the 1973 Legislative Assembly enacted Senate Bill No. 2026 which made some major changes in the entire program of financing elementary and secondary education in North Dakota. Among the major features of Senate Bill No. 2026 were the following:

1. The state appropriation grew from $54 million in 1971-73 to over $118 million in 1973-75, although the latter figure included about $25 million which would have been distributed to school districts through the personal property payback formula but were added to the Foundation Program.

2. The base support payment per pupil, which is the amount used to determine the amount each school district will receive after the application of weighting factors, was increased from $260 to $540 per pupil. It was estimated this would equal about 65 to 70 percent of the actual cost of education.

3. The flat weighting factor for all high schools was changed to provide four classes of high school weighting factors and some adjustments were made in elementary school weighting factors.

4. A 20-mill school district equalization factor was incorporated into the formula, but unlike the 21-mill county levy, this equalization was not a mandatory levy but was used in determining the state payment to school districts.

5. A portion of federal impact aid received by school districts was subtracted from the state payment to those districts receiving such moneys.

6. Transportation payments for school buses were increased from 16 cents to 23 cents per mile for larger buses and from 7 cents to 10 cents per mile for smaller buses.

7. The maximum mill levy for high school districts was reduced from 34 to 24 mills and those districts with excess levies or unlimited levies were required to also reduce their levies.

8. To be eligible for Foundation Program payments, school districts were required to certify that, except for vocational and special education programs and new programs related to new facilities, and courses of study eliminated in the previous two years, no new courses of study had been implemented since the effective date of the law unless the new courses had been approved unanimously by the school boards.

During the course of the 1971-73 interim study, a new element was introduced into the school finance picture. On August 31, 1971, a landmark opinion on school finance was handed down by the California Supreme Court in the case of Serrano v. Priest. The California Court held that the level of spending for a child's publicly financed education should not depend upon the wealth of the child's school district or family. The court found that as a direct result of the property tax system, the residents of a poor district often pay taxes at a higher rate than residents of more wealthy districts, and such inequities were found in violation of the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution. Although a similar case in Texas, Rodriquez v. San Antonio Independent School District, was later reversed by the United States Supreme Court, the view was expressed that it was not fear of court action that prompted the 1973 law but rather it was based upon the conviction that the financing of schools is a state responsibility and that every effort should be made to provide the most equitable system of providing equal educational opportunity to all North Dakota pupils.

1973 - 1975

Because the 1973 law was temporary and scheduled to expire at the end of the 1973-75 biennium, another study was conducted during the interim before the 1975 Session. As a result of that study, the 1975 Legislative Assembly made permanent the basic concepts which were included in the 1973 law. The base payment was increased from $540 to $640 per pupil for the first year and $690 per pupil the second year of the 1975-77 biennium. The 1975 legislation, which was also numbered Senate Bill No. 2026, made some changes in weighting factors for elementary pupils, including a new classification for 7th and 8th grade pupils in recognition of the higher costs associated with junior high school instruction.

The 1975 law included increased transportation payments for larger buses to 26 cents per mile plus 15 cents per day for each pupil transported except that the 15-cent-per-day payment would not be made for transporting pupils to schools located in the cities in which such pupils lived. The payment for smaller school buses was also increased to 12 cents per mile.

To protect school districts with declining enrollments by giving them time in which to adjust, there was a provision that no school district would receive less in Foundation Program payments for any year than such school district would have received based upon its enrollment the previous school year.

Proportionate payments for students enrolled in nonpublic schools for graduation but who take specific courses in the public schools were continued. In addition, proportionate payments were provided to school districts offering summer high school programs if each course offered in such programs satisfied requirements for graduation and comprised at

least as many clock hours as courses offered during the regular school term. The deductionsof the 21-mill levy portion of federal impact aid payments were continued unchanged with the exception of certain pupils residing in tax-exempt federally owned mobile homes who were specifically excluded from the calculation of the amount to be deducted.

The 1975 law did not change the 24-mill maximum levy established for high school districts. However, school districts with fewer than 4,000 population were allowed to approve specific mill levies, while school districts with more than 4,000 population could levy either a specific number of mills or an unlimited mill levy, with either alternative subject to approval by the electorate. The 1975 legislation also included language urging school districts to give first consideration to the use of state funds to increase teachers' salaries.

The appropriation for the Foundation Program was increased from $118 million for 1973-75 to $153,378,805 for 1975-77.

1975 - 1977

The 1975 Legislative Assembly, in addition to passing Senate Bill No. 2026 which made the new provisions permanent, also passed a resolution calling for a continuing study of educational finance during the 1975-1977 interim. Special attention was to be given to the action of school districts in charging for textbooks and assessing student fees, the effectiveness of the Foundation Program in achieving quality education, salary and negotiation practices for teachers, and consideration of limiting state funding to a basic curriculum.

House Bill No. 1026 was enacted by the 1977 Legislative Assembly and included many of the recommendations of the interim committee. The base payment was increased to $775 per pupil the first year and $850 the second year of the 1977-79 biennium. Special education preschool pupils between three and six years of age will entitle school districts to a payment equal to approximately one-half of the base payment. The report of the interim committee indicates that this payment takes into consideration the fact that preschool children do not spend an entire day in school and that school districts also receive special education funds for these pupils.

The 1977 legislation increased the transportation payment to 34 cents per mile for larger school buses and 17 cents per mile for smaller buses with no change in the provision concerning the 15-cent-per-day payment for each pupil transported on the larger buses.

Another bill enacted in 1977, Senate Bill No. 2025, provides that the residence district of the child as defined in existing law be liable for the excess costs of special education. House Bill No. 1281 provides for Foundation Program payments to school districts for pupils absent from classes for not exceeding one semester while such students are on active duty with the North Dakota National Guard. Legislation concerning the elimination of student fees and textbook charges and collective bargaining by public employees was considered but not enacted in 1977.

For the 1977-79 biennium, the Foundation Program appropriation is $186,752,000. This appropriation includes $11 million in federal revenue sharing funds as provided in Senate Bill No. 2549.

EQUALIZATION OF NONPROPERTY TAX REVENUES

As noted previously, a portion of federal impact aid moneys received by school districts with federal installations or with pupils from such installations in the districts are subtracted from the State Foundation Program payments to those districts. One of the reasons for the federal impact aid program is that federal properties are not subject to local property taxes, and thus the payments are in lieu of property taxes. Because property taxes are equalized, the Legislative Assembly concluded that it was equitable that a portion of such in lieu payments also be equalized. In other words, if the school districts were receiving such additional revenues in property taxes, the State Foundation Program payment would be reduced by the revenue raised by a total of 41 mills (21 mills for the county equalization levy and 20 mills for the school district equalization factor). However, the current Foundation Program provides for the equalization of only the 21-mill county levy portion of federal aid payments.

During the 1973-75 interim the Committee on Education concluded that if federal impact aid payments were considered in determining Foundation Program payments, it would also be proper to take into account those revenues received by school districts for oil and gas production taxes. As a result of this study, Senate Bill No. 2027 was introduced in the 1975 Session which would have subtracted school district portions of oil and gas taxes from state payments to counties. After Senate Bill No. 2027 was defeated, House Bill No. 1500 was introduced. This bill would have subtracted only the 21-mill levy portion of oil and gas gross production tax payments. In other words, such payments would have been handled in the same manner as federal impact aid payments. House Bill No. 1500 was indefinitely postponed in the House.

The 1975 Legislative Assembly enacted a new coal severance tax and a new coal conversion facilities tax on electrical generating plants and other coal development plants. The coal severance tax law originally provided for no automatic payments directly to school districts, but created a coal development impact office which distributes funds to impacted cities, counties, school districts, and other taxing districts. The coal conversion facilities tax provided a payment of a portion of funds allocated to the county in which each plant is located to be distributed to the school districts in that county. The 1977 Session reenacted the coal severance tax law and included a direct distribution of funds to school districts in coal-producing counties.

Although neither the coal severance tax law nor the coal conversion facilities tax law provides for consideration of the allocated school district funds in determining Foundation Program payments, such a proposal was considered by the Senate as an amendment to House Bill No. 1026. This amendment would have reduced Foundation Program payments to any district receiving revenues from the oil and gas gross production tax, the coal conversion facilities tax, or the coal severance tax, but not from the coal impact fund. This amendment was adopted by the Senate Committee on Education but was defeated by the Senate in favor of a study during the 1977-79 interim.

House Concurrent Resolution No. 3037 calls for a study of the financial effect on school districts of large industrial plants, both those subject to property taxes and those subject to taxes in lieu of property taxes, including a study of deductions from Foundation Program payments for taxes received from such plants and other sources of tax revenue. Under existing law, if a school district has a large industrial plant located within its limits, the revenues distributed to that school district are handled differently depending upon the type of industrial plant.

Most large industrial plants are subject to property taxes, and therefore the taxes from such plants are taken into account in determining the Foundation Program payments due that district. First, the amount raised by the 21-mill levy on the property is subtracted. Then the amount represented by the 20-mill equalization factor is subtracted. The equivalent of 41 mills against the taxable evaluation of the industrial plant is therefore deducted from the state payment to the school district.

If, on the other hand, the industrial plant is a "coal conversion facility" as defined in subsection 2 of Section 57-60-01, the plant is subject to the taxes imposed by that chapter. The revenues are allocated between the state and county under a formula in Section 57-60-14, and the county share is then allocated to cities in the county, the county general fund, and school districts in the county under the formula in Section 57-60-15. This section provides that 30 percent of the revenue allocated to the county shall be apportioned to school districts in the county on an average daily membership basis. These moneys are in lieu of property taxes on the coal conversion facilities and are not considered in determining Foundation Program payments to the school districts receiving such funds.

HEW GRANT FOR STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL FINANCE

The Superintendent of Public Instruction has received a grant from the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare under a federal program of assistance to states to study equalization plans. This study will be conducted by Dr. Richard L. Hill, Professor of Education at the Center for Teaching and Learning at the University of North Dakota. Dr. Hill will be working with personnel in the Department of Public Instruction, local school officials, and others during the course of this study and will make periodic reports to the Committee on Education of the Legislative Council.

The broad purpose of the study will be to frame recommendations for modification of the present Foundation Program to more nearly equalize educational opportunity. It is anticipated that this study will supplement the work of the committee and will assist the committee members in obtaining information on a number of the issues under consideration during this interim.

Forty-Fifth Legislative Assembly, State of North Dakota begun and held at the Capitol in the City of Bismarck, on Tuesday, the fourth day of January, one thousand nine hundred and seventy-seven.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 3037
(Knudson)

A concurrent resolution directing the Legislative Council to conduct a continuing study of financing of elementary and secondary schools, and of the effectiveness of such financing in reaching the goal of providing the best possible education for North Dakota's students.

WHEREAS, North Dakota has had a formalized State Foundation Program for elementary and secondary education since 1959; and

WHEREAS, population shifts and school district reorganization have resulted in major changes in the patterns of expenditures of public funds for elementary and secondary schools since that time; and

WHEREAS, changing times have resulted in changes in educational programs and curriculums, with increased emphasis on special programs, summer sessions, and transportation, all of which have resulted in the placing of a greater burden upon the educational dollar; and

WHEREAS, recent court decisions have focused attention on the fact that the state has an obligation to provide an equal educational opportunity for all students; and

WHEREAS, changes in school districts and programs in recent years, together with the fact that expenditures for schools continue to accelerate, call attention to the need for a continuing study of educational finance in North Dakota in order to assure the citizens of this state the maximum return on their investment for education; and

WHEREAS, there is a need to study the financial effect on school districts of large industrial plants, both those subject to property taxes and those subject to taxes in lieu of property taxes, including a study of deductions from Foundation Program payments for taxes received from such plants and other sources of tax revenue; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has made available a grant to study educational finance in North Dakota during the 1977-79 biennium;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA, THE SENATE CONCURRING THEREIN:

That the Legislative Council, with the assistance of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, is hereby directed to study the entire field of the financing of elementary and secondary schools in North Dakota, with emphasis upon the Foundation Program, the effect of various tax sources on school districts, school transportation costs, costs of summer sessions and the relationship and impact of such programs on Foundation Program payments, and the methods of accounting and reporting used by the various schools and school districts; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Legislative Council make its report and recommendations to the Forty-sixth Legislative Assembly, together with any legislation required to carry out such recommendations.

/s/ Oscar Solberg
Speaker of the House

/s/ Roy Gilbreath
Chief Clerk of the House

FILED APRIL...21....197..7..

/s/ Wayne G. Sanstead
President of the Senate

/s/ Leo Leidholm
Secretary of the Senate

Filed in this office this _____ day of _____, 1977, at _____ o'clock _____ M.

_____
Secretary of State

INTERVIEWS WITH SCHOOL OFFICIALS

The FESEND Survey was designed to determine how the "new" foundation program had been received by school people throughout the state and to learn what direction they felt the program should take.

The interview was directed to those administrators who had been in their positions prior to the passage of "2026". Specifically, "users" were selected who had been in the position from 1972-73 until the 1977-78 school year.

A total of ninety superintendents were chosen to be interviewed. A schedule of questions and a cover letter were sent to each superintendent to be interviewed. Within ten days a member of the FESEND study team called the superintendent and took responses, questions, and additional comments over the phone. Responses were obtained for 87 of the 90 sampled. The sample breakdown by size of school was as follows:

School Size	Number of Superintendents
1 - 74	21
75 - 149	30
150 - 549	29
550 - Up	7
	Total 87

Brief discussion accompanies the computer output for each of the questions on the interview schedule.

1. The "new" foundation law sought to more nearly equalize educational opportunity across the state by equalizing school revenue. In your opinion, the quest for equalization was desirable.

TABLE 1

THE QUEST FOR EQUALIZATION WAS DESIRABLE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
STRONGLY AGREE	1.	39	44.8	44.8	44.8
AGREE	2.	44	50.6	50.6	95.4
DISAGREE	3.	3	3.4	3.4	98.9
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4.	1	1.1	1.1	100.0
	TOTAL	87	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.609	STD ERR	0.066	MEDIAN	1.602
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.617	VARIANCE	0.380
KURTOSIS	1.226	SKEWNESS	0.789	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		
VALID CASES	87	MISSING CASES	0		

Using the adjusted frequency of responses, 46% of the superintendents strongly agreed that the quest for equalization was desirable. An additional 49.4% agreed that the quest was desirable, thus accounting for 95.4% of the responses. Only 4.5% disagreed.

2. Associated with the new foundation program were increases in transportation supports from the state. In your opinion, increases in state support for the transportation function were desirable.

TABLE 2

INCREASES IN STATE SUPPORT FOR TRANSPORTATION WERE DESIRABLE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
STRONGLY AGREE	1.	57	65.5	65.5	65.5
AGREE	2.	23	26.4	26.4	92.0
DISAGREE	3.	4	4.6	4.6	96.6
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4.	3	3.4	3.4	100.0
	TOTAL	87	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.460	STD ERR	0.080	MEDIAN	1.263
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.744	VARIANCE	0.554
KURTOSIS	3.074	SKEWNESS	1.788	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		
VALID CASES	87	MISSING CASES	0		

Increases in the state support for the transportation function was very desirable for 66.7% of the superintendents. Another 25.3% agreed that it was desirable. A small percentage (8%) disagreed with the increased state support.

3. The "new" foundation law, when contrasted with the old foundation law (prior to 1973), generally increased the fraction of school revenue received from state sources and reduced the fraction of school revenue from local sources. In your opinion, increasing the state's share of the burden was desirable.

TABLE 3

INCREASING THE STATE'S SHARE OF THE FINANCIAL BURDEN FOR EDUCATION WAS DESIRABLE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
STRONGLY AGREE	1.	49	56.3	57.0	57.0
AGREE	2.	35	40.2	40.7	97.7
DISAGREE	3.	2	2.3	2.3	100.0
DON'T KNOW	5.	1	1.1	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	87	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.453	STD ERR	0.059	MEDIAN	1.378
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.546	VARIANCE	0.298
KURTOSIS	-0.741	SKEWNESS	0.633	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		
VALID CASES	86	MISSING CASES	1		

Senate Bill 2026 increased the fraction of school revenue received from the state. Fifty-seven percent of those responding felt that this approach was very desirable. Another 40.7% agreed that it was desirable for a total of 97.7% in agreement that increasing the state's share was desirable.

4. Suppose the present mix of state, local and federal dollars supporting education is 50%, 40%, and 10% respectively. Which of the following future patterns would you see as desirable (assuming that the federal portion does not change)? Check one.

_____ 70-20-10 State share increases significantly
_____ 60-30-10 State share increases slightly
_____ 50-40-10 The proportion of state and local supports would remain approximately as they are at the present time
_____ 40-50-10 Local share would increase slightly
_____ 30-60-10 Local share would increase significantly.

TABLE 4

DESIRABLE MIX OF STATE, LOCAL, AND FEDERAL SUPPORT OF EDUCATION

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
70-20-10	1.	52	59.8	59.8	59.8
60-30-10	2.	26	29.9	29.9	89.7
50-40-10	3.	9	10.3	10.3	100.0
	TOTAL	87	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.506	STD ERR	0.073	MEDIAN	1.337
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.680	VARIANCE	0.462
KURTOSIS	-0.199	SKEWNESS	1.001	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		
VALID CASES	87	MISSING CASES	0		

When asked for future patterns in the level of state funding, 58.6% responded that they would like to see the state's share increase significantly while another 31% would like to see it increase slightly. Ten percent felt that it should remain where it was. None of the respondents opted for an increase in the local share of the mix. A majority of 89.7% would like to see the state's share of the burden for schools increased.

5. Which of the following positions most nearly approaches your view of <u>future</u> state responsibility for the transportation burden of school districts?

_____ The state should assume all of the costs of transportation
_____ The state should assume a larger percentage of the costs of transportation but require a percentage of local contribution
_____ The state transportation rate should stay at the same percentage of costs as presently exists (allowing for yearly inflation rate adjustment)
_____ The state should provide a smaller percentage of the costs of transportation.

TABLE 5

FUTURE STATE RESPONSIBILITY FOR TRANSPORTATION

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
ALL COSTS	1.	16	18.4	18.4	18.4
LARGER PERCENT	2.	45	51.7	51.7	70.1
STAY THE SAME	3.	21	24.1	24.1	94.3
SMALLER PERCENT	4.	5	5.7	5.7	100.0
	TOTAL	87	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.172	STD ERR	0.085	MEDIAN	2.111
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.795	VARIANCE	0.633
KURTOSIS	-0.121	SKEWNESS	0.388	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		
VALID CASES	87	MISSING CASES	0		

Many superintendents indicated that transportation is a burden. Seventeen and two-tenths percent of the superintendents would like the state to assume all of the burden of transportation. Another 51.7% would like the state to assume at least a larger percentage of the burden. More than 25% said that the rate should stay at the same percentage of costs as presently exists. A cumulative 69% would like to see the state assume a larger share of the transportation burden.

6. When determining the foundation payment to the school district an equalization factor is presently employed in which 20 mills is multiplied against the taxable valuation of a district and then subtracted from the gross foundation entitlement. In your opinion, should the 20 mill equalization factor be:

_____ increased (made more than 20 mills)
_____ decreased (made less than 20 mills)
_____ remain as it is
_____ not certain.

TABLE 6a

OPINIONS ON THE 20 MILL EQUALIZATION FACTOR

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
INCREASED	1.	11	12.6	12.6	12.6
DECREASED	2.	36	41.4	41.4	54.0
STAY THE SAME	3.	25	28.7	28.7	82.8
NOT SURE	4.	15	17.2	17.2	100.0
	TOTAL	87	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.506	STD ERR	0.099	MEDIAN	2.403
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.926	VARIANCE	0.858
KURTOSIS	-0.816	SKEWNESS	0.163	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		
VALID CASES	87	MISSING CASES	0		

There was a considerable amount of hesitation and doubt in answering this particular question, as pointed out by the high percentage (16.1%) answering in the not sure column. Respondents felt primarily that the quest for equalization was desirable as evidenced by the results obtained on question #1. However, most of the respondents answered this question with reference to what it was doing to their own particular district, which was to remove money from their revenue sources. They saw this as a loss of revenue and, therefore, something which should be reduced. The largest percentage (41.4%) felt that it should be reduced, 29.9% felt it was presently at the correct level and 12.6% opted for an increase in the 20 mill equalization factor.

A crosstabs analysis was run with question #1 against question #6. The greatest number of respondents, 21 of the 87 (24.1%), agreed that the quest for equalization was desirable but appeared to disagree with the present method of equalization; they voted to have the 20 mill equalization factor reduced. Another 12.6% strongly agreed with the idea of equalization but disagreed with the 20 mills in that they would like to see it reduced. Twelve and six-tenths percent of the sample indicated they agreed with the equalization concept and opted for an increase in the equalization factor.

TABLE 6b

CROSSTABS ANALYSIS - TABLE 1 AGAINST TABLE 6a

QUES1	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	QUES6 1. INCREASE D	2. DECREASE D	3. STAY THE SAME	4. NOT SURE	ROW TOTAL
1. STRONGLY AGREE		7	11	16	5	39
		17.9	28.2	41.0	12.8	44.8
		63.6	30.6	64.0	33.3	
		8.0	12.6	18.4	5.7	
2. AGREE		4	21	9	10	44
		9.1	47.7	20.5	22.7	50.6
		36.4	58.3	36.0	66.7	
		4.6	24.1	10.3	11.5	
3. DISAGREE		0	3	0	0	3
		0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	3.4
		0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	
		0.0	3.4	0.0	0.0	
4. STRONGLY DISAGREE		0	1	0	0	1
		0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
		0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	
		0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	
COLUMN TOTAL		11	36	25	15	87
		12.6	41.4	28.7	17.2	100.0

7. The legislature should continue to employ cost statistics as a means for determining index numbers and payments. (The "cost basis" is a proper basis for determining index numbers and payments.)

TABLE 7

CONTINUE TO USE COST STATISTICS AS A MEANS FOR DETERMINING INDEX NUMBERS AND PAYMENTS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
STRONGLY AGREE	1.	19	21.8	22.4	22.4
AGREE	2.	54	62.1	63.5	85.9
DISAGREE	3.	9	10.3	10.6	96.5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4.	3	3.4	3.5	100.0
DON'T KNOW	5.	2	2.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	87	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.953	STD ERR	0.075	MEDIAN	1.935
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.688	VARIANCE	0.474
KURTOSIS	1.396	SKEWNESS	0.733	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		
VALID CASES	85	MISSING CASES	2		

The foundation program presently uses cost statistics to determine the index numbers and payments. A majority (85.9%) of the respondents were in agreement that the "cost basis" was a proper way to determine index numbers. There was some concern expressed, however, that some schools found it easier to increase services, and thus costs, than other schools and that care must be taken to see that educational needs are being met.

8. Costs should be reviewed each biennium to determine whether the "educational support per child" should be adjusted (in 1977-78 the support per pupil will be $775 and in 1978-79 the support per pupil will be $850).

TABLE 8

COSTS SHOULD BE REVIEWED EACH BIENNIUM

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT
STRONGLY AGREE	1.	42	48.3	48.3	48.3
AGREE	2.	44	50.6	50.6	98.9
DISAGREE	3.	1	1.1	1.1	100.0
	TOTAL	87	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.529	STD ERR	0.056	MEDIAN	1.534
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.525	VARIANCE	0.275
KURTOSIS	-1.440	SKEWNESS	0.130	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		
VALID CASES	87	MISSING CASES	0		

There was almost total agreement that costs should be reviewed each biennium to determine the "educational support per child", a concern elaborated on by many of the superintendents as they discussed their battles with inflation. An aggregated frequency of 98.9% were in agreement on this question.

9. Cost relationships (relationship of costs of elementary vs. secondary levels and among sizes of schools) should be reviewed each biennium to determine whether index numbers should be adjusted.

TABLE 9

COST RELATIONSHIPS SHOULD BE REVIEWED EACH BIENNIUM

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
STRONGLY AGREE	1.	32	36.8	37.6	37.6
AGREE	2.	43	49.4	50.6	88.2
DISAGREE	3.	8	9.2	9.4	97.6
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4.	2	2.3	2.4	100.0
DON'T KNOW	5.	2	2.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	87	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.765	STD ERR	0.078	MEDIAN	1.744
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.718	VARIANCE	0.515
KURTOSIS	0.723	SKEWNESS	0.780	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		
VALID CASES	85	MISSING CASES	2		

The superintendents felt, for the most part, that the cost relationships between different sizes of schools and different levels of schooling should be examined each biennium. Slightly over 88% were in agreement with 11.8% disagreeing.

Fluctuating enrollment continues to be a problem for many schools in North Dakota. The present foundation program does recognize that there is a problem. It states, "No school district shall receive less in foundation program per pupil payments for any year than such district would have received in such payments based upon the enrollment in such district in the previous school year."

10. The enrollment pattern in our district over the past five years has:

_____ declined (we have more than a 10% loss of students)
_____ remained approximately the same
_____ increased (we have grown more than 10% in numbers of students)

A similar question asked superintendents to predict the next five years.

TABLE 10a

ENROLLMENT PATTERN OVER PAST 5 YEARS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
ADD	1.	52	59.8	59.8	59.8
REDUCE	2.	32	36.8	36.8	96.6
INCREASED	3.	3	3.4	3.4	100.0
	TOTAL	87	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.437	STD ERR	0.061	MEDIAN	1.337
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.564	VARIANCE	0.319
KURTOSIS	-0.280	SKEWNESS	0.850	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		
VALID CASES	87	MISSING CASES	0		

TABLE 10b

ENROLLMENT PREDICTED OVER NEXT 5 YEARS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
ADD	1.	46	52.9	52.9	52.9
REDUCE	2.	35	40.2	40.2	93.1
INCREASED	3.	6	6.9	6.9	100.0
	TOTAL	87	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.540	STD ERR	0.067	MEDIAN	1.446
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.625	VARIANCE	0.391
KURTOSIS	-0.436	SKEWNESS	0.722	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		
VALID CASES	87	MISSING CASES	0		

Questions ten and eleven dealt with declining enrollment in the state. A majority of the schools sampled indicated that they had experienced decline and would continue to do so in the next five years.

TABLE 11

CROSSTABS ANALYSIS - TABLE 10a AGAINST SCHOOL SIZE

QUESTION	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	SIZE 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1. ADD		12	15	21	4	52
		23.1	28.8	40.4	7.7	59.8
		60.0	50.0	72.4	50.0	
		13.8	17.2	24.1	4.6	
2. REDUCE		8	13	8	3	32
		25.0	40.6	25.0	9.4	36.8
		40.0	43.3	27.6	37.5	
		9.2	14.9	9.2	3.4	
3. INCREASED		0	2	0	1	3
		0.0	66.7	0.0	33.3	3.4
		0.0	6.7	0.0	12.5	
		0.0	2.3	0.0	1.1	
COLUMN TOTAL		20	30	29	8	87
		23.0	34.5	33.3	9.2	100.0

A crosstabs analysis was run with question #10 against the four categories of school size. The school size of 150 to 549 students showed the greatest amount of decline with 21 schools, or 72.4% of the schools in this size range, declining. Sixty percent of the sampled schools in the size range 1 - 74 showed a decline in enrollment. Only 2.3% of those sampled showed an increase in the number of students.

12. Providing assistance to districts which experience declining enrollment problems is a <u>proper</u> part of the foundation program.

TABLE 12

A PROPER PART OF THE FOUNDATION PROGRAM IS TO ASSIST DISTRICTS WHICH EXPERIENCE DECLINING ENROLLMENT

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
STRONGLY AGREE	1.	27	31.0	31.0	31.0
AGREE	2.	54	62.1	62.1	93.1
DISAGREE	3.	6	6.9	6.9	100.0
	TOTAL	87	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.759	STD ERR	0.061	MEDIAN	1.806
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.570	VARIANCE	0.325
KURTOSIS	-0.345	SKEWNESS	0.029	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		
VALID CASES	87	MISSING CASES	0		

A strong majority felt that providing assistance to schools with enrollment decline was a proper part of the foundation program. The small portion disagreeing felt that assistance was being used to keep small schools open.

13. The assistance provided by the section quoted from state law above is an adequate or sufficient compensation for the phase-down problems school districts experience with declining enrollments.

TABLE 13

THE SAVE HARMLESS PROVISION FOR DECLINING ENROLLMENT IS ADEQUATE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
STRONGLY AGREE	1.	6	6.9	7.1	7.1
AGREE	2.	44	50.6	51.8	58.8
DISAGREE	3.	28	32.2	32.9	91.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4.	7	8.0	8.2	100.0
DON'T KNOW	5.	2	2.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	87	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.424	STD ERR	0.081	MEDIAN	2.330
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.746	VARIANCE	0.557
KURTOSIS	-0.123	SKEWNESS	0.356	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		
VALID CASES	85	MISSING CASES	2		

In relating to declining enrollments, although a majority did feel that the assistance provided through the foundation was adequate, most of the superintendents who did agree did so reluctantly or with hesitation. Quite a large percentage (42.3%) disagreed that the provisions were adequate.

14. Have you added to or reduced your program offerings or student services during the last five years? If so, please indicate the reason or reasons which caused the change. (1) increased money from state, (2) mill levy increase, (3) change of enrollment, (4) inflation, or (5) other.

Reduced/added	Name of Program	Reason(s)
_____	Courses or programs in the Secondary Schools (9-12)	_____
_____	Courses or programs at the Junior High Level (7-8)	_____
_____	Courses or programs at the Elementary Level (K-6)	_____
_____	Services at Secondary Level (e.g., guidance, library)	_____
_____	Services at Elementary Level (e.g., library, specialists)	_____
_____	Changed ratio of students to teachers	_____
_____	Extra class activities (interscholastic competition and other extra curricular experiences)	
_____	Other (please list)_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Superintendents were asked to indicate which areas of the school had experienced change over the last five years and to identify some of the reasons for those changes. The statistical output for just one portion of that question is shown below. The data for the question were aggregated into a table.

TABLE 14

PROGRAM CHANGES FOR PAST FIVE YEARS

	Added	Remained the same	Reduced
Courses of programs 9-12	51.1%	38.9	10 %
Courses or programs 7-8	27.8%	68.9%	3.3%
Courses or programs K-6	31.1%	60.0%	8.9%
Services Sec. level (Guidance, etc.)	26.7%	65.6%	7.8%
Services Elem. (Library, aides, etc.)	32.2%	63.3%	4.4%
Student-teacher ratio	15.6%	63.3%	21.1%
Extra curricular	34.4%	64.4%	1.1%
Other	6.7%	92.2%	1.1%

Courses and programs at the secondary level had the highest percentage of improvement with 51%. This same area had a relatively high amount of reduction in courses or programs. The discrepancy may perhaps be explained in that many schools are adding vocational programs at the same time many schools are experiencing declining enrollments and, consequently, cuts in programs.

Extra curricular also had a rather substantial increase, due perhaps to the effects of Title 9 and the subsequent increase in girls' sports.

15. If, in the next five years, you received more money from the state, what programs would you add or improve? Please give a priority rating to each by circling a (1) for top priority or a (5) for lowest priority. For those which you have given a top priority (#1 rating), please indicate the specific change you have in mind. Each program should have a rating.

	Top Priority			Lowest Priority		Specific Change
Courses or programs (9-12)	1	2	3	4	5	_____
Courses or programs (7-8)	1	2	3	4	5	_____
Courses or programs (K-6)	1	2	3	4	5	_____
Services in secondary	1	2	3	4	5	_____
Services in elementary	1	2	3	4	5	_____
Decreased student-teacher ratio	1	2	3	4	5	_____
Extra curricular	1	2	3	4	5	_____
Other	1	2	3	4	5	_____

Superintendents were asked to give priority ratings to the different areas of the school to determine what needed improvement. They could select more than one priority. The computer results for the secondary program area are shown as an example below. Each area was aggregated into a table.

TABLE 15a

PRIORITY RATING TO ADD OR IMPROVE COURSES OR PROGRAMS IN GRADES 9-12

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
	1.	39	44.8	44.8	44.8
	2.	14	16.1	16.1	60.9
	3.	16	18.4	18.4	79.3
	4.	7	8.0	8.0	87.4
	5.	11	12.6	12.6	100.0
	TOTAL	87	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.276	STD ERR	0.153	MEDIAN	1.821
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	1.428	VARIANCE	2.039
KURTOSIS	-0.783	SKEWNESS	0.748	RANGE	4.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		
VALID CASES	87	MISSING CASES	0		

TABLE 15b

PRIORITY OF PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT FOR FUTURE

	Top Priority	Lowest Priority	Specific Type of Improvements
Courses or programs 9-12	43.3%	12.2%	Ind. arts/Voc., electives, art
Courses or programs 7-8	20.0%	18.9%	Ind. arts/Voc., Reading
Courses or programs K-6	18.9%	26.7%	P. E., art
Services in Secondary	22.2%	25.6%	Guidance, Library
Services in Elementary	23.3%	20.0%	Library
Student-teacher ratio	8.9%	53.3%	
Extra Curricular	1.1%	65.6%	
Other	3.3%	88.9%	Administration

16. If, in the next five years, you receive <u>less</u> money from the state, what would you cut from the program? Each program should have a rating.

	Cut First			Cut Last		Specific Cut
Courses or programs (9-12)	1	2	3	4	5	_____
Courses or programs (7-8)	1	2	3	4	5	_____
Courses or programs (K-6)	1	2	3	4	5	_____
Services in secondary	1	2	3	4	5	_____
Services in elementary	1	2	3	4	5	_____
Increased student-teacher ratio	1	2	3	4	5	_____
Extra curricular	1	2	3	4	5	_____
Other	1	2	3	4	5	_____

A further question dealing with programs explored which areas of the school would possibly be cut first and which last if financial conditions warranted a cut. Because of the copious amount of data generated by the question, an example is shown and then the pertinent data aggregated into a table.

TABLE 16a

PRIORITY RATING TO CUT COURSES OR PROGRAMS IN GRADES 9-12

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
	1.	33	37.9	37.9	37.9
	2.	19	21.8	21.8	59.8
	3.	11	12.6	12.6	72.4
	4.	4	4.6	4.6	77.0
	5.	20	23.0	23.0	100.0
	TOTAL	87	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.529	STD ERR	0.170	MEDIAN	2.053
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	1.584	VARIANCE	2.508
KURTOSIS	-1.230	SKEWNESS	0.584	RANGE	4.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		
VALID CASES	87	MISSING CASES	0		

TABLE 16b

PROGRAMS WITH TOP PRIORITY FOR CUTTING

	Highest Priority	Lowest Priority	Specific Cuts
Courses or programs (9-12)	35.6%	22.2%	Voc./Ind. Arts, Foreign Lang., Art
Courses or programs (7-8)	4.4%	52.2%	Music, Art
Courses or programs (K-6)	10.0%	51.1%	Music, P.E.
Services Secondary	22.2%	31.1%	Guidance, Library
Services Elementary	11.1%	40.0%	Guidance, Music, P.E., Library
Student-teacher ratio	28.9%	27.8%	
Extra curricular	32.2%	14.4%	Sports, Transportation, Band
Other	6.7%	81.1%	Transportation, Administration

Courses or programs in grades 9-12 were seen by superintendents as the area they would pick to cut. Extra curricular was also a favorite choice. It also received the least number of choices for lowest priority, thus extra curricular would be a top choice for cutting.

17. The following programs should be included in and funded through the foundation program in some way.

TABLE 17a

SPECIAL EDUCATION SHOULD BE FUNDED THROUGH THE FOUNDATION PROGRAM

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
STRONGLY AGREE	1.	47	54.0	54.7	54.7
AGREE	2.	26	29.9	30.2	84.9
DISAGREE	3.	8	9.2	9.3	94.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4.	5	5.7	5.8	100.0
DON'T KNOW	5.	1	1.1	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	87	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.663	STD ERR	0.094	MEDIAN	1.415
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.876	VARIANCE	0.767
KURTOSIS	0.841	SKEWNESS	1.259	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		
VALID CASES	86	MISSING CASES	1		

A majority (54%) of superintendents strongly agreed that special education should be funded through the foundation program in some way. Another 31% agreed, while 14.9% disagreed.

TABLE 17b

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SHOULD BE FUNDED THROUGH THE FOUNDATION PROGRAM

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
STRONGLY AGREE	1.	24	27.6	29.3	29.3
AGREE	2.	40	46.0	48.8	78.0
DISAGREE	3.	12	13.8	14.6	92.7
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4.	6	6.9	7.3	100.0
	0.	1	1.1	MISSING	100.0
DON'T KNOW	5.	4	4.6	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	87	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.000	STD ERR	0.095	MEDIAN	1.925
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.861	VARIANCE	0.741
KURTOSIS	0.084	SKEWNESS	0.715	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		
VALID CASES	82	MISSING CASES	5		

The question of funding vocational education through the foundation program did not receive the strong positive response that special education received although a majority of superintendents did agree (78.3%) that it should be included.

TABLE 17c

KINDERGARTEN SHOULD BE FUNDED THROUGH THE FOUNDATION PROGRAM

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
STRONGLY AGREE	1.	35	40.2	42.7	42.7
AGREE	2.	25	28.7	30.5	73.2
DISAGREE	3.	14	16.1	17.1	90.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4.	8	9.2	9.8	100.0
DON'T KNOW	5.	5	5.7	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	87	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.939	STD ERR	0.110	MEDIAN	1.740
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.998	VARIANCE	0.996
KURTOSIS	-0.579	SKEWNESS	0.735	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		
VALID CASES	82	MISSING CASES	5		

Funding kindergarten, although a majority of superintendents were in agreement (65.6%), had a fairly large number in disagreement (25.6%). Five of the sample answered "Don't know".

18. The "new" foundation program has helped provide the financial backing needed in order to retain or improve your district's accreditation status.

TABLE 18

THE "NEW" FOUNDATION PROGRAM HAS HELPED ACCREDITATION

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
STRONGLY AGREE	1.	22	25.3	25.9	25.9
AGREE	2.	46	52.9	54.1	80.0
DISAGREE	3.	14	16.1	16.5	96.5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4.	3	3.4	3.5	100.0
	0.	1	1.1	MISSING	100.0
DON'T KNOW	5.	1	1.1	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	87	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.976	STD ERR	0.082	MEDIAN	1.946
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.756	VARIANCE	0.571
KURTOSIS	0.251	SKEWNESS	0.548	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		
VALID CASES	85	MISSING CASES	2		

A fairly large percentage (80%) of respondents to question #18 agreed that the foundation program had helped to retain or improve the districts' accreditation status. Many of the interviewees mentioned that declining enrollment and inflation were hindering those improvements.

19. The "new" foundation law accelerated the payment schedule for "State Aids". This feature reduced cash flow problems (there is less need to borrow money using "C.I.'s") in the local school district.

TABLE 19

THE "NEW" FOUNDATION PROGRAM REDUCED CASH FLOW PROBLEMS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
STRONGLY AGREE	1.	30	34.5	34.5	34.5
AGREE	2.	47	54.0	54.0	88.5
DISAGREE	3.	8	9.2	9.2	97.7
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4.	2	2.3	2.3	100.0
	TOTAL	87	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.793	STD ERR	0.075	MEDIAN	1.787
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.701	VARIANCE	0.492
KURTOSIS	0.833	SKEWNESS	0.726	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		
VALID CASES	87	MISSING CASES	0		

Most of the interviewees agreed that the accelerated payment schedule had helped relieve cash flow problems. Others mentioned that they would like to see still more funds earlier. Inflation was cited as a continuing problem, thus the need for certificates of indebtedness continues.

20. The "new" foundation law increased the dollar flow from state sources. The size of the increase exceeded the rate of inflation experienced by local schools.

TABLE 20

THE "NEW" FOUNDATION PROGRAM INCREASE EXCEEDED THE RATE OF INFLATION

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
STRONGLY AGREE	1.	1	1.1	1.2	1.2
AGREE	2.	16	18.4	19.0	20.2
DISAGREE	3.	50	57.5	59.5	79.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4.	17	19.5	20.2	100.0
	0.	1	1.1	MISSING	100.0
DON'T KNOW	5.	2	2.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	87	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.988	STD ERR	0.073	MEDIAN	3.000
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	0.668	VARIANCE	0.446
KURTOSIS	0.064	SKEWNESS	-0.236	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		
VALID CASES	84	MISSING CASES	3		

Inflation was one word which almost everyone interviewed used at least once in his comments. A majority (77.6%) either disagreed or strongly disagreed that the size of the increases in state foundation money had exceeded the rate of inflation.

21. Resources made available through the foundation law since 1973 have permitted districts to increase salaries for professional and classified employees (more than would have been under the old foundation law which relied more heavily on local revenue).

TABLE 21

THE "NEW" FOUNDATION PROGRAM PERMITTED DISTRICTS TO INCREASE SALARIES

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
STRONGLY AGREE	1.	31	35.6	35.6	35.6
AGREE	2.	52	59.8	59.8	95.4
DISAGREE	3.	4	4.6	4.6	100.0
	TOTAL	87	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.690	STD ERR	0.060	MEDIAN	1.740
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.556	VARIANCE	0.310
KURTOSIS	-0.598	SKEWNESS	0.027	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		
VALID CASES	87	MISSING CASES	0		

Only 3.4% disagreed with question #21. The majority felt that the foundation program had helped tremendously in permitting districts to increase salaries for professional and classified employees. A few of the superintendents mentioned that salary increases had eaten up funds for other school improvements.

22. State law presently provides for approximately twenty-five separate school finance funds. (Examples: library, communication, social security, general fund, etc.) The number of funds for school finance should be reduced by combining.

TABLE 22

THE NUMBER OF FUNDS FOR SCHOOL FINANCE SHOULD BE REDUCED BY COMBINING

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
STRONGLY AGREE	1.	28	32.2	32.6	32.6
AGREE	2.	35	40.2	40.7	73.3
DISAGREE	3.	21	24.1	24.4	97.7
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4.	2	2.3	2.3	100.0
DON'T KNOW	5.	1	1.1	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	87	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.965	STD ERR	0.088	MEDIAN	1.929
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.818	VARIANCE	0.669
KURTOSIS	-0.779	SKEWNESS	0.329	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		
VALID CASES	86	MISSING CASES	1		

A majority (70%) agreed that the number of funds should be reduced. However, 25.5% did disagree. The oft-repeated comment was that it was easier to obtain voter approval on items where the money had to be earmarked for definite purposes.

23. The foundation program should make a distinction between the inefficiency resulting from sparsity and the inefficiency resulting from the local option to remain small. Small schools should be supported differently in the two examples.

TABLE 23

THE FOUNDATION PROGRAM SHOULD DISTINGUISH BETWEEN SPARSITY AND SMALL BY LOCAL OPTION

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
STRONGLY AGREE	1.	32	36.8	37.2	37.2
AGREE	2.	41	47.1	47.7	84.9
DISAGREE	3.	8	9.2	9.3	94.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4.	5	5.7	5.8	100.0
DON'T KNOW	5.	1	1.1	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	87	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.837	STD ERR	0.089	MEDIAN	1.768
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.824	VARIANCE	0.679
KURTOSIS	0.718	SKEWNESS	0.959	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		
VALID CASES	86	MISSING CASES	1		

When asked whether the foundation program should make a distinction between a small school remaining small because of sparsity and other small schools remaining small because of local option, 36% of the superintendents strongly agreed that it should. Another 48.8% agreed making a total in agreement of 84.9%.

24. The foundation program should make an effort to reimburse small schools (less than 74 in secondary) which are necessary because of sparsity and distance to the next school.

TABLE 24

THE FOUNDATION PROGRAM SHOULD REIMBURSE SCHOOLS SMALL DUE TO SPARSITY

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
STRONGLY AGREE	1.	29	33.3	33.3	33.3
AGREE	2.	51	58.6	58.6	92.0
DISAGREE	3.	4	4.6	4.6	96.6
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4.	3	3.4	3.4	100.0
	TOTAL	87	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.782	STD ERR	0.074	MEDIAN	1.784
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.689	VARIANCE	0.475
KURTOSIS	1.999	SKEWNESS	0.970	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		
VALID CASES	87	MISSING CASES	0		

Item #24, though similar to #23, did not have the negative connotations of item #23. An even higher majority of superintendents (92%) agreed that small but necessary schools--those schools which are small because of sparsity and distance to the next school--should be reimbursed by the foundation program. Only 8% of the superintendents sampled disagreed with the idea.

LONGITUDINAL FINANCIAL DATA

This section contains financial data on all the school districts in North Dakota. The data are displayed by districts by year and by size, and those described by the table title and line items included for that table. For example, Table 1 indicates expenditures by line item for one-room rural schools in North Dakota for years 1974, 1975, and 1976. Looking at the first line item, 0112, we see that two one-room rural schools reported data for this line item in 1974, no one-room rural schools reported data for this line item in 1975, while one one-room rural school reported data for this line item in 1976. This means that three schools, or 2.3% of the 145 one-room rural schools, reported data on this line item for this three-year period. The mean column indicates that the average per pupil expenditure reported on line item 0112 for one-room rural schools in 1974 was approximately $5.12. In 1976 it was approximately $1.11, and for the three-year period the average was approximately $3.78. The standard deviation of approximately $.64 in 1974 indicates that about 68% of the cases should fall between $4.48 and $5.76 ($5.12 ± $.64) and that about 95% of the cases should fall between $3.84 and $6.40 ($5.12 ± $1.28). In 1976 there is only one case and, therefore, no standard deviation about the mean. The standard deviation about the mean of the entire population is approximately $2.26.

There are two basic reasons for the variance in the number of schools of a specified type over a given number of years. Schools of one type may close, thus reducing the number of schools of that type or they may be reclassified from one type to another, thus reducing the number of schools of one type and increasing the number of schools of another type.

The variance in the number of cases reported on each line item may indicate that there is some confusion as to how an expense should be coded. For instance, some one-

room rural schools have listed expenses for the superintendent's office and principal's salaries. Some expenses, such as textbooks, may not occur every year. Other expenses, such as periodicals and newspapers, may not occur in all schools.

Some of the data for 1972 were contaminated and therefore unusable. All of the financial data for 1973 were missing.

The preceding general description applies to all the tables. A brief description of each table follows.

Table 1 shows that the standard deviation about the mean for each line item in one-room rural schools is nearly as large or larger than the average expenditure per-pupil for each line item. This might indicate that there is a great disparity in per-pupil expenditures among one-room rural schools. It should be noted that the average per pupil expenditure on many of the largest expense items decreases over the three year period. The standard deviation decreases even more rapidly than the mean. The decrease each year in the number of schools reporting these large expense items could help to explain the trend. A possibility is that the least cost-effective one-room rural schools in existence in 1974 did not exist in 1976. On the other hand, an increase of only a few students could decrease the per pupil expense significantly in a one-room rural school.

Conclusion

Interpreting data for one-room rural schools was rendered difficult because such schools occur both in high school districts and in "one-room rural" districts; both pro-rated data and pure data were contained in the data presented. Greater clarity could occur if one room "buildings" were separated from one room "districts," a possibility which was not undertaken in the project.

TABLE 1

PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE IN 1-8 ONE-ROOM RURAL SCHOOLS

Criterion Variable	MEAN 1974	MEAN 1975	MEAN 1976	MEAN For entire population	STD DEV 1974	STD DEV 1975	STD DEV 1976	STD DEV For entire population	NUMBER OF CASES 1974	NUMBER OF CASES 1975	NUMBER OF CASES 1976	NUMBER OF CASES For entire population	PTC
0112	5.12		1.11	3.78	.64		0.0	2.26	2		1	3/145	2.3
0211		940.00		940.00		0.0		0.0		1		1/145	.7
0212		701.86		701.86		0.0		0.0		1		1/145	.7
0213	988.79	967.31	888.67	952.11	1476.05	916.55	351.71	1049.83	29	26	23	78/145	53.8
0214	130.38	58.53	23.95	94.64	187.37	47.33	0.0	141.58	4	2	1	7/145	4.8
0220	28.89	31.29	33.02	31.02	21.02	22.04	17.39	20.20	21	25	19	65/145	44.8
0231	4.97	9.39	10.86	8.16	3.20	9.19	7.36	7.25	16	15	12	43/145	28.7
0232	1.70	3.58	3.80	3.13	0.67	3.48	2.03	2.55	11	14	14	39/145	26.9
0233	6.28	7.45	3.43	5.72	5.90	7.11	2.56	5.66	14	14	14	42/145	29
0240	17.70	26.80	27.66	23.71	16.14	26.46	24.05	22.61	26	25	20	71/145	49
0610	4.11	5.28	8.70	6.35	1.98	3.69	5.99	4.74	6	5	8	19/145	13.1
0630	102.47	105.87	85.12	98.58	205.72	156.91	53.18	155.80	29	27	23	79/145	54.5
0640	85.07	36.59	35.19	53.76	324.25	36.77	27.76	196.22	29	28	23	80/145	55.2
Staff	973.21	971.81	889.71	948.44	1453.60	915.22	350.80	1044.13	30	26	23	79/145	54.5

Administration	0100	School Library Books	0231
Salaries	0110	Periodicals and Newspapers	0232
Superintendents Office	0112	Audio-Visual Materials	0233
Instruction	0200	Teaching Supplies	0240
Salaries	0210	Operation of Plant and Equipment	0600
Principals	0211	Salaries	0610
Consultants and Supervisors	0212	Heat for Buildings	0630
Teachers	0213	Utilities, Except Heat for Building	0640
Other Instructional Staff	0214	Staff	0213 and 0214
Textbooks	0220		
School Library and Audio-Visual	0230		

Table 2 displays per-pupil expense data for students in grades 1 - 6 for high school and graded elementary school districts. Graded elementary school districts are elementary districts which, unlike one-room rural school districts, have more than one teacher in the school system. Each of the line item expenses is displayed according to three district size types: those with average daily membership (ADM) less than 100 pupils, those with ADM greater than or equal to 100 pupils but less than 1000 pupils, and those with ADM greater than or equal to 1000 pupils.

One of the first things noticeable about this data is that the larger the size type the more consistent the number of cases reported for each line item appears to be over the five-year period. It is also evident that the smallest school districts have the largest per pupil expenses on all selected line items. It appears that on many line items the standard deviation about the mean is significantly smaller than it was for the one-room rural schools.

TABLE 2

PER PUPIL EXPENDITURES IN 1-6 HIGH SCHOOL AND GRADED ELEMENTARY DISTRICTS

		Size Type 1 ADM<100						Size Type 2 100≤ADM<1000						Size Type 3 ADM≥1000							
		MEAN						STD DEV						NUMBER OF CASES							
Criterion Variable	Size Type	1972	1974	1975	1976	For Type	For entire population	1972	1974	1975	1976	For Type	For entire population	1972	1974	1975	1976	No Cases	No./ Total	PTC/ Total
0112	1	47.41	45.01	61.63	72.23	57.44	49.90	39.14	32.91	40.85	44.45	41.26	35.35	105	104	115	126	450		
	2	39.42	41.61	48.66	49.78	44.95		16.41	27.99	36.84	20.62	27.24		104	125	119	114	462	946/	78.6
	3	12.33	16.10	18.07	21.62	17.31		4.90	5.13	6.82	7.03	6.70		7	9	9	9	34	1203	
0211	1	86.98	41.02	55.05	53.57	59.11	44.54	102.94	35.52	72.08	51.96	71.13	45.05	44	39	49	58	190		
	2	35.21	32.03	38.33	41.57	36.92		18.38	15.01	20.47	20.77	19.13		82	82	87	90	341	565/	47.0
	3	31.26	34.87	41.86	48.09	39.48		7.60	10.08	5.93	5.54	9.64		7	9	9	9	34	1203	
0212	1	184.68	174.17	31.08	13.62	91.61	48.96	280.18	380.67	38.68	11.80	224.93	122.89	3	6	9	3	21		
	2	28.66	91.46	32.63	27.58	48.81		20.05	144.82	62.64	38.27	92.41		11	18	15	16	60	106/	8.8
	3	11.61	13.83	12.28	16.17	13.70		2.78	8.84	5.53	6.11	6.37		4	7	7	7	25	1203	
0213	1	679.98	555.43	656.55	725.90	654.54	603.79	193.78	178.32	257.17	216.18	222.91	191.90	144	162	166	169	641		
	2	519.54	475.04	551.09	616.66	539.49		107.90	95.69	95.21	113.13	115.06		106	128	122	116	472	1147/	95.3
	3	469.70	469.36	573.40	630.45	539.61		93.39	85.90	116.48	71.94	113.42		7	9	9	9	34	1203	
0214	1	20.26	36.68	39.98	55.54	41.81	33.78	26.39	35.93	51.01	140.67	88.60	65.48	25	50	53	65	193		
	2	23.65	28.24	29.97	39.34	30.50		20.01	36.86	40.18	63.07	43.47		57	69	69	66	261	485/	40.3
	3	38.23	43.84	43.19	45.20	42.75		19.37	32.09	36.57	49.79	45.17		7	8	8	8	31	1203	
0220	1	10.98	12.31	13.95	17.37	13.76	12.35	7.92	8.19	9.22	12.64	10.01	8.67	138	154	160	160	612		
	2	8.36	9.39	11.00	12.82	10.47		4.69	5.55	6.01	7.12	6.16		91	128	120	114	453	1398/	91.3
	3	11.85	11.03	13.56	11.01	12.02		6.37	6.74	6.94	5.91	6.01		6	9	9	9	33	1203	
0231	1	7.66	5.98	6.58	6.39	6.66	6.29	5.08	4.69	5.39	4.35	4.91	4.37	135	140	145	151	571		
	2	7.16	6.08	5.11	5.69	5.97		4.23	3.34	3.23	3.46	3.67		99	124	114	111	448	1052/	87.1
	3	4.98	5.28	5.18	4.53	4.99		1.13	1.76	2.56	1.54	1.80		7	8	9	9	33	1203	
0232	1	2.23	1.53	2.02	2.29	2.01	1.66	1.59	1.05	1.60	1.58	1.50	1.35	61	111	118	136	426		
	2	1.36	1.18	1.26	1.34	1.28		1.07	1.12	0.99	1.01	1.04		61	94	95	94	344	804/	66.8
	3	0.82	1.00	1.19	1.15	1.05		0.41	0.77	0.93	0.81	0.75		7	9	9	9	34	1203	
0233	1	2.81	3.80	4.11	3.55	3.68	3.35	2.45	5.76	7.07	4.46	5.50	4.35	51	102	116	129	398		
	2	2.74	2.82	3.22	3.18	3.01		4.28	2.21	2.65	2.57	2.85		62	108	101	103	374	806/	67.0
	3	2.90	2.75	3.66	3.41	3.19		1.04	1.34	1.83	2.44	1.74		7	9	9	9	34	1203	
0240	1	24.45	29.44	32.47	36.73	31.02	30.06	17.86	19.17	19.62	22.03	20.24	18.64	143	162	167	167	639		
	2	22.18	28.18	31.08	34.59	29.15		13.91	13.67	13.67	23.25	17.10		106	130	122	116	474	1147/	95.3
	3	19.31	20.38	28.78	29.61	24.83		9.96	7.56	17.16	11.72	12.61		7	9	9	9	34	1203	
0610	1	46.82	51.99	60.83	66.94	57.01	48.99	16.86	27.43	33.67	34.22	30.15	25.72	138	148	155	157	598		
	2	34.51	34.22	41.21	46.41	39.10		11.31	11.42	13.24	15.73	13.96		103	127	120	115	465	1097/	91.2
	3	32.70	39.31	46.38	51.15	42.96		7.71	13.93	14.21	15.52	14.58		7	9	9	9	34	1203	
0630	1	27.71	44.39	50.15	56.26	45.20	36.99	14.53	27.75	27.42	27.61	27.23	24.76	141	157	160	163	621		
	2	18.22	26.85	30.22	34.27	27.63		7.89	15.26	18.20	17.78	16.49		103	129	121	114	467	1122/	93.3
	3	9.18	14.61	19.24	18.05	15.63		3.25	8.36	9.65	7.76	8.39		7	9	9	9	34	1203	
0640	1	24.71	25.68	30.95	36.20	29.58	26.26	8.60	12.73	14.81	17.25	14.58	12.95	143	159	162	165	629		
	2	20.88	18.99	22.97	26.82	22.35		9.14	7.11	8.71	10.17	9.24		106	130	122	116	474	1137/	94.5
	3	19.60	16.64	20.22	21.59	19.51		6.57	5.72	4.67	4.17	5.37		7	9	9	9	34	1203	
Staff	1	183.49	566.75	669.31	747.26	667.13	618.30	193.50	179.99	264.36	212.04	225.04	196.03	144	162	166	169	641		
	2	532.25	486.46	568.04	639.04	555.18		106.84	109.46	105.04	139.22	128.53		106	129	122	116	473	1148/	95.4
	3	507.93	508.32	611.79	670.63	578.59		98.62	78.45	96.57	81.07	110.14		7	9	9	9	34	1203	

Table 3 displays per pupil expenditures for high school and graded elementary school districts. In Table 3 the per pupil expenditures are for students in kindergarten through grade eight and are displayed by line item according to district type.

Table 3 indicates that a fairly consistent number of cases were reported for each line item each year, especially during the 1974-76 period. The standard deviation about the mean is larger for graded elementary schools for every line item except "audio-visual materials" (where they are almost the same) and for "other instructional staff". There is a large variation in the 0212 line item for these years, but that is possibly a result of inconsistent reporting of items for those same years. Generally, it appears that when there is a great deal of consistency in reporting data from year-to-year there is also a great deal of consistency in per pupil expenditure fluctuation from year to year. On this table, one may observe that the average per-pupil expenditure for the entire population always is close to the per-pupil expenditure for high school districts for the four years indicated.

TABLE 3

PER PUPIL EXPENDITURES IN K-8

Criterion Variable	Distr. Type	Type 1 High School District — MEAN 1972	1974	1975	1976	For Type	For entire population	Type 1 — STD DEV 1972	1974	1975	1976	For Type	For entire population	Type 2 Graded Elementary District — NUMBER OF CASES 1972	1974	1975	1976	No Cases	N/ Total (For entire population)	PTC Total
0112	1	47.50	43.80	51.78	63.03	51.97	50.85	31.44	28.59	34.39	36.02	33.48	34.01	217	226	231	238	912	958/	
	2	17.32	20.49	44.64	31.97	28.77		25.79	29.11	43.45	44.86	37.20		11	12	12	11	46	1203	79.6
0211	1	31.28	32.30	40.58	43.29	37.24	39.46	28.91	22.28	42.71	31.24	32.74	35.22	134	140	153	162	589	624/	
	2	60.31	83.70	78.98	81.07	76.85		20.08	32.28	51.09	74.99	51.70		7	7	10	11	35	1203	51.9
0212	1	33.38	52.03	22.07	21.39	32.86	43.52	83.36	108.84	30.93	26.45	72.74	114.72	23	33	30	28	114	121/	
	2	117.41	941.67	54.36		217.15		211.28	0.0	76.61		355.32		4	1	2		7	1203	10.1
0213	1	459.55	513.58	590.72	669.01	557.49	560.01	95.05	135.71	147.92	162.28	158.34	171.18	259	255	252	251	1015	1199/	
	2	476.77	525.03	631.98	680.71	573.93		196.34	180.28	236.88	247.28	229.51		52	44	45	43	184	1203	99.7
0214	1	19.34	27.68	30.81	41.14	30.18	30.79	23.50	30.34	40.43	92.39	55.92	34.94	112	119	120	131	482	548/	
	2	38.17	38.02	33.56	32.21	35.26		85.08	33.46	24.07	32.64	47.30		15	15	18	18	66	1203	45.6
0220	1	8.31	10.18	11.72	13.72	10.96	11.89	4.77	6.03	6.42	7.71	6.60	8.26	250	251	248	241	990	1165/	
	2	12.94	14.12	18.09	24.30	17.19		9.45	10.26	12.05	17.51	13.25		48	43	42	42	175	1203	96.8
0231	1	5.96	6.15	5.92	6.13	6.04	5.94	3.50	4.02	4.36	3.93	3.96	4.15	242	240	233	235	950	1105/	
	2	5.49	4.54	5.74	5.51	5.33		7.14	2.86	5.44	3.79	5.17		44	37	38	36	155	1203	91.9
0232	1	1.09	1.37	1.62	1.82	1.52	1.56	0.83	1.07	1.35	1.33	1.22	1.25	129	201	210	220	760	868/	
	2	1.80	0.96	1.36	1.89	2.56		0.44	1.08	1.26	1.80	1.43		15	32	29	32	108	1203	72.2
0233	1	2.20	3.10	3.47	3.21	3.08	3.16	2.34	3.91	5.25	3.47	4.01	4.01	124	190	196	213	723	838/	
	2	3.55	3.34	3.87	3.95	3.69		3.55	4.19	3.74	4.46	4.00		18	32	34	31	115	1203	69.7
0240	1	19.83	28.79	31.47	35.94	28.96	28.57	11.51	14.82	15.11	18.83	16.34	18.35	256	257	253	250	1016	1198/	
	2	22.32	25.13	29.30	29.56	26.40		35.66	23.10	24.63	19.76	26.90		51	44	45	42	182	1203	99.6
0610	1	34.02	41.71	49.32	55.34	45.05	47.27	11.37	14.99	18.52	21.44	18.76	25.30	249	248	246	245	988	1138/	
	2	51.63	54.26	68.01	74.64	61.93		37.93	47.01	51.08	53.40	48.01		40	36	38	36	150	1203	94.6
0630	1	18.66	33.11	38.92	44.93	33.81	35.67	8.91	19.15	22.02	24.88	21.89	23.96	252	253	248	245	998	1174/	
	2	27.24	52.32	50.22	59.66	46.26		16.13	37.29	28.74	31.92	31.41		51	42	42	41	176	1203	97.6
0640	1	18.80	22.45	28.24	32.55	25.45	25.33	6.29	9.62	11.81	12.19	11.49	12.56	256	256	251	249	1012	1186/	
	2	18.89	23.51	24.80	32.37	24.81		11.30	15.36	15.94	23.94	17.55		49	42	42	41	174	1203	98.6
Staff	1	467.97	522.40	602.99	690.48	570.13	572.17	97.22	141.76	160.84	159.99	165.35	178.82	257	257	253	251	1018	1203/	
	2	478.58	538.00	645.41	694.20	583.41		232.70	183.07	234.21	246.80	240.05		53	44	45	43	185	1203	100.0

Table 4 displays per pupil expenditures for plant and equipment based on average daily membership in high school districts. For students in grades 9 - 12 the average per pupil expenditure diminishes as the size of the school gets larger. The standard deviations about the means for the middle-sized schools, when compared with those of the largest-size schools, indicate that some of the middle-sized schools may have smaller per pupil expenditures in this area than some of the largest schools.

For students in grades K - 8, the mean expenditure also decreases as the size of the school increases. The standard deviation about the mean also decreases consistently with an increase in size type. The difference in the standard deviation of size types three and four is not very great, however.

For students in grades 7 - 8 the per pupil expenditures in this area for the largest schools are greater than for the middle-sized schools. The standard deviation about the mean decreases consistently as the size type increases.

TABLE 4

PER PUPIL EXPENDITURES FOR PLANT AND EQUIPMENT BASED ON AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP IN HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Size Types: 1 — ADM<75 2 — 75≤ADM<150 3 — 150≤ADM<550 4 — 550≤ADM

Per Pupil Expense 9-12

Size Type	MEAN 1972	1974	1975	1976	For Size	For entire population	STD DEV 1972	1974	1975	1976	For Size	For entire population	NUMBER OF CASES 1972	1974	1975	1976	For Size	For entire population	PTC
1	1132.15	1233.44	1439.58	1574.47	1403.65		225.06	308.16	367.50	345.06	363.82		5	97	97	100	299		
2	840.95	1007.29	1156.67	1288.16	1086.91		138.94	171.60	183.79	202.23	238.17		60	82	83	77	302		
3	730.94	953.95	1122.08	1218.55	938.83	1115.52	125.55	153.04	162.79	162.07	246.11	347.31	142	66	61	62	331	1018	100
4	699.10	996.42	1205.97	1293.64	894.27		112.84	135.46	173.87	160.67	277.64		50	12	12	12	86		

Per Pupil Expense K-8

1	1132.15	1015.10	1199.48	1371.06	1195.92		225.06	319.52	322.55	305.37	345.07		5	97	97	100	299		
2	840.95	882.42	1050.08	1155.44	989.87		138.94	168.81	188.33	196.25	215.45		60	82	83	77	302		
3	730.94	845.09	984.12	1108.55	871.09	998.01	125.55	133.23	148.33	180.43	204.43	291.30	142	66	61	62	331	1018	100
4	699.10	863.46	1006.88	1143.34	826.97		112.84	115.21	105.35	119.06	202.08		50	12	12	12	86		

Per Pupil Expense 7-8

1		1072.65	1242.45	1464.85	1262.07			469.10	396.70	402.27	452.29			97	97	100	294		
2		847.55	1008.67	1107.46	984.81			216.82	244.27	241.74	256.82			82	81	76	239	758/ 761	
3		794.60	966.08	1079.69	943.46	1086.88		167.13	231.04	260.05	250.40	371.92		66	61	62	189		99.6
4		914.12	1072.98	1272.91	1086.67			148.09	161.10	229.94	232.01			12	12	12	36		

Table 5 displays per pupil expenditures in high school districts for grades 9 - 12. Each of the fourteen selected line items is broken down by school size type. Though there are exceptions, the data generally indicate that the larger the school the smaller its per pupil expenditures will tend to be. The largest expense items show the largest disparity. Expenditures generally go up each year.

TABLE 5

PER PUPIL EXPENDITURES IN HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICTS FOR GRADES 9-12

Size Types: 1 - ADM<75 2 - 75≤ADM<150 3 - 150≤ADM<550 4 - 550≤ADM

Criterion Variable	Size Type	MEAN 1972	1974	1975	1976	For Size	For entire population	STD DEV 1972	1974	1975	1976	For Size	For entire population	NUMBER OF CASES 1972	1974	1975	1976	For Size	For entire population	PTC Total
0112	1		58.67	72.41	82.22	71.93			50.41	63.79	54.07	57.05			72	80	89	241		
	2		51.81	59.40	72.36	61.25	57.34		21.20	19.75	29.96	25.40	40.25		74	78	76	228	693/	
	3		37.02	41.05	45.87	41.20			11.99	12.71	15.65	13.92			66	61	61	188	1018	68.1
	4		16.31	19.46	21.98	19.25			5.27	5.91	6.14	6.09			12	12	12	36		
0211	1	53.00	79.90	58.00	68.53	68.29		73.14	111.22	61.71	77.05	84.16		2	38	41	46	127		
	2	71.40	42.11	58.81	52.25	53.76	48.15	56.74	25.99	80.13	25.55	52.87	50.13	16	40	53	55	164	615/	
	3	24.13	39.30	45.08	51.09	39.07		18.00	13.98	15.71	16.12	19.05		69	60	55	57	241	1018	60.4
	4	27.18	31.69	41.23	46.31	32.63		9.85	7.71	9.51	7.82	11.74		47	12	12	12	83		
0212	1		22.00	19.16	18.55	19.59			27.80	18.93	11.93	18.10			4	8	6	18		
	2	5.11	19.06	23.52	21.23	19.81	33.84	0.0	16.29	25.28	32.78	20.72	77.32	1	4	2	3	10	109/	
	3	65.50	94.84	27.33	29.66	55.72		130.60	184.15	24.36	27.77	117.55		9	13	10	12	44	1018	10.7
	4	13.31	18.36	23.64	22.10	18.54		9.50	14.92	16.67	14.50	13.67		13	8	8	8	39		
0213	1	663.44	717.84	851.01	879.43	814.18		130.21	192.32	241.93	269.68	245.83		5	97	97	100	299		
	2	517.42	584.47	654.21	708.26	621.77	641.60	98.72	122.64	128.03	127.31	138.83	210.13	60	82	82	77	301	1015/	
	3	446.10	535.74	623.01	676.12	539.69		83.78	84.48	102.37	84.72	127.46		142	64	61	62	329	1018	99.7
	4	407.90	548.39	649.87	691.35	500.82		47.91	79.46	85.68	87.92	133.23		50	12	12	12	86		
0214	1	26.38	26.73	39.88	57.30	41.59		21.93	34.86	70.67	170.46	111.24		3	28	24	32	87		
	2	18.85	25.30	25.82	32.12	26.64	31.42	21.98	29.07	30.36	35.88	30.83	55.70	18	24	30	36	108	442/	
	3	20.51	29.80	31.18	31.97	27.97		30.68	21.05	26.21	22.22	25.88		49	38	40	42	169	1018	43.4
	4	17.68	44.46	57.58	58.00	34.14		12.67	30.46	42.26	34.85	31.39		42	12	12	12	78		
0220	1	12.45	12.95	14.12	15.61	14.20		8.44	7.90	9.22	9.24	8.79		5	93	94	93	285		
	2	10.39	9.90	12.49	14.33	11.84	11.47	5.24	5.64	7.29	7.69	6.82	7.25	58	79	80	75	292	973/	
	3	7.71	9.16	11.02	11.36	9.28		4.41	4.89	5.64	5.98	5.27		138	60	57	60	315	1018	95.6
	4	7.12	10.19	11.85	13.80	9.05		4.31	5.83	6.88	7.32	5.85		49	10	11	11	81		
0231	1	4.22	7.48	7.17	7.22	7.23		2.64	5.55	5.93	5.00	5.45		5	89	87	94	275		
	2	6.48	6.71	6.40	5.94	6.38		3.70	3.67	4.87	3.92	4.09		54	75	76	69	274	950/	
	3	6.10	6.58	6.00	6.71	6.30	6.52	3.43	3.66	2.78	3.17	3.32	4.26	134	65	58	60	317	1018	93.3
	4	5.20	5.87	5.83	5.74	5.46		3.46	2.75	3.01	2.00	3.11		49	11	12	12	84		
0232	1	0.70	2.14	2.52	2.96	2.35		0.11	1.48	1.96	1.92	1.84		2	75	81	91	249		
	2	1.62	2.14	2.18	2.19	2.11		0.98	1.52	1.38	1.38	1.39		24	64	71	68	227	785/	
	3	1.06	1.32	1.73	2.04	1.50	1.98	0.83	1.06	0.99	1.62	1.20	1.53	71	61	54	55	241	1018	77.1
	4	0.77	1.32	1.54	1.66	1.16		0.47	0.64	0.87	0.79	0.74		32	12	12	12	68		
0233	1	5.40	3.28	4.77	3.58	3.89		0.0	4.06	8.97	3.77	6.04		1	58	64	73	196		
	2	2.42	3.43	3.20	2.97	3.12	3.29	3.42	6.19	3.13	2.67	4.12	4.20	20	57	61	66	204	706/	
	3	1.98	3.29	3.44	3.56	3.00		1.85	2.61	2.65	2.53	2.48		69	57	55	55	236	1018	69.4
	4	2.41	3.48	4.10	3.79	3.12		2.49	2.11	1.72	1.89	2.29		34	12	12	12	70		
0234	1	17.91	31.25	32.39	37.11	33.34		7.59	18.41	16.50	18.95	18.09		5	97	97	99	298		
	2	18.38	33.21	33.59	36.80	31.28	30.21	9.19	17.70	15.82	16.87	16.86	17.20	60	82	83	77	302	1016/	
	3	20.89	27.35	32.54	34.50	26.89		12.48	12.64	14.74	14.59	14.47		141	66	61	62	330	1018	99.8
	4	18.80	39.53	42.30	43.08	28.36		11.44	26.91	22.29	30.95	22.06		50	12	12	12	86		

Table 5--Continued

Criterion Variable	Size Type	MEAN 1972	1974	1975	1976	For Size	For entire population	STD DEV 1972	1974	1975	1976	For Size	For entire population	NUMBER OF CASES 1972	1974	1975	1976	For Size	No./ Total	PTC/ Total
0610	1	61.97	56.29	62.80	68.34	62.57		11.86	18.31	22.31	25.58	22.63		5	92	92	97	286		
	2	43.40	41.76	47.06	54.33	46.80	48.10	10.02	14.00	16.42	17.72	15.79	20.31	58	77	81	75	291	982/	
	3	31.04	38.30	48.42	50.86	39.34		9.19	13.83	15.73	15.39	15.22		137	66	58	59	320	1018	96.5
	4	28.42	40.93	49.17	54.43	36.79		7.24	9.63	11.86	14.74	14.09		49	12	12	12	85		
0630	1	36.96	49.03	54.60	62.18	55.01		15.03	27.57	30.22	30.67	29.80		5	96	95	98	294		
	2	23.85	34.94	39.51	46.54	36.93	37.01	8.82	18.69	22.83	22.39	20.93	25.23	59	81	82	75	297	999/	
	3	17.98	29.38	31.69	36.01	26.15		7.87	13.95	15.41	16.39	14.57		139	64	59	61	323	1018	98.1
	4	12.48	18.32	21.73	24.49	16.31		3.90	9.73	11.18	13.18	9.12		49	12	12	12	85		
0640	1	27.22	30.02	36.71	41.90	36.12		8.49	12.75	14.29	14.70	14.69		5	97	97	100	299		
	2	22.40	25.11	30.49	34.48	28.45	28.11	6.61	9.32	13.46	12.40	11.87	13.22	59	81	82	76	298	1014/	
	3	18.18	22.08	26.88	29.62	22.70		5.52	8.35	10.58	11.13	9.55		142	66	61	62	331	1018	99.6
	4	15.49	22.44	26.50	29.63	19.97		5.05	8.22	8.55	8.21	8.57		50	12	12	12	86		
Staff	1	679.27	725.55	860.88	897.77	826.28		128.76	193.12	253.34	255.11	245.57		5	97	97	100	299		
	2	523.07	591.88	663.66	723.28	631.33	654.63	99.74	123.22	130.46	130.53	142.10	212.58	60	82	82	77	301	1016/	
	3	453.18	544.92	643.46	697.78	552.38		88.05	108.61	101.31	85.36	136.46		142	65	61	62	330	1018	99.8
	4	422.75	592.85	707.45	749.35	531.78		52.40	84.39	89.06	101.31	153.03		50	12	12	12	86		

Table 6 displays per pupil expenditures in high school districts for grades K - 8. Each of the fourteen selected line items is broken down by school size type. Though there are exceptions, as in Table 5, the data generally show that the larger the school district is, the smaller its per pupil expenditures will tend to be. The largest expense items show the largest disparity. As in Table 5, expenditures generally go up each year. For every line item, the per pupil expenditure for the entire population is larger for grades 9 - 12 than it is for grades K - 8.

TABLE 6

PER PUPIL EXPENDITURES IN HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICTS FOR GRADES K-8

Size Types: 1 - ADM<75 2 - 75≤ADM<150 3 - 150≤ADM<550 4 - 550≤ADM

Criterion Variable	Size Type	MEAN 1972	1974	1975	1976	For Size	For entire population	STD DEV 1972	1974	1975	1976	For Size	For entire population	NUMBER OF CASES 1972	1974	1975	1976	For Size	No./ Total	PTC Total
0112	1	47.76	47.18	64.55	76.73	63.66		65.65	33.15	42.09	45.85	42.75		2	73	79	89	243		
	2	45.70	52.53	59.45	66.10	57.45	51.97	51.59	31.61	32.15	24.36	34.11	33.48	38	75	79	76	268	912/	
	3	54.28	35.01	39.08	43.21	45.16		25.95	12.55	15.34	16.85	21.57		127	66	61	61	315	1018	89.6
	4	31.64	16.96	20.20	22.95	26.79		12.24	4.81	7.21	6.83	11.74		50	12	12	12	86		
0211	1	51.00	41.54	46.27	56.28	48.63		73.14	35.98	39.56	52.84	44.20		2	32	37	40	111		
	2	71.40	28.49	40.79	35.77	39.31		56.74	19.63	64.82	19.93	44.74		16	37	50	53	156	589/	
	3	24.13	28.69	36.23	40.35	31.86	37.24	18.00	12.99	15.17	17.23	17.21	32.74	69	59	54	57	239	1018	57.9
	4	27.18	17.17	41.76	47.18	35.63		9.83	9.13	7.12	6.58	11.84		47	12	12	12	83		
0212	1		19.26	24.73	11.99	20.78			18.54	25.49	10.82	20.60			4	8	4	16		
	2	5.11	77.43	47.32	15.75	50.44	32.86	0.0	75.28	74.50	19.81	65.54	72.74	1	6	4	3	14	114/	
	3	65.50	69.98	15.52	27.81	45.87		130.60	152.44	15.90	36.48	104.85		9	15	10	13	47	1018	11.2
	4	13.31	15.69	14.97	17.79	15.15		9.50	10.77	10.90	10.04	9.91		11	8	8	8	37		
0213	1	663.44	570.22	648.01	743.00	654.80		130.21	174.63	187.43	200.17	199.09		5	97	97	100	299		
	2	517.42	484.42	569.32	630.77	551.56		98.72	102.08	118.23	122.07	124.26		60	82	82	77	301	1015/	
	3	446.10	471.65	535.39	603.40	497.27	557.49	83.78	72.13	75.52	89.81	101.10	158.34	142	64	61	62	329	1018	99.7
	4	407.90	478.56	555.06	636.88	470.24		47.91	79.80	89.17	69.35	105.03		50	12	12	12	86		
0214	1	26.38	30.82	41.90	58.34	44.10		21.93	34.28	60.10	159.11	104.11		3	33	29	39	104		
	2	18.85	25.19	28.33	37.03	28.81	30.18	21.98	30.36	31.79	35.84	31.81	55.92	18	32	35	38	123	482/	
	3	20.51	24.89	23.05	28.94	24.18		30.68	24.63	25.96	41.12	31.08		49	42	44	42	177	1018	47.3
	4	17.68	35.47	39.65	40.96	27.38		12.67	38.57	45.39	33.73	29.47		42	12	12	12	78		
0220	1	12.45	11.49	12.67	15.08	13.06		4.44	6.78	7.41	8.91	7.81		5	94	95	93	287		
	2	10.39	9.59	11.98	14.40	11.64		5.24	5.40	5.95	7.31	6.31		58	80	81	76	295	990/	
	3	7.71	9.17	9.83	11.34	9.08	10.96	4.41	5.37	5.19	5.79	5.20	6.60	138	66	61	61	326	1018	97.2
	4	7.12	9.43	12.13	10.82	8.60		4.31	6.06	5.20	5.33	5.11		49	11	11	11	82		
0231	1	4.22	6.15	6.51	6.67	6.41		2.64	5.10	5.06	4.62	4.89		5	89	88	94	276		
	2	6.48	6.32	5.93	5.62	6.07		3.70	2.97	4.81	3.42	3.80		54	75	75	69	273	950/	
	3	6.10	6.62	5.14	6.05	5.90	6.04	3.43	3.70	2.48	3.53	3.36	3.96	134	65	58	60	317	1018	93.3
	4	5.20	5.63	5.24	5.12	5.25		3.46	2.14	2.11	1.63	2.91		49	11	12	12	84		
0232	1	0.79	1.61	2.01	2.41	2.02		0.11	1.03	1.72	1.57	1.51		2	73	78	87	240		
	2	1.62	1.44	1.57	1.66	1.57		0.98	1.17	1.20	1.17	1.15		24	60	67	66	217	760/	
	3	1.06	1.06	1.21	1.24	1.14	1.52	0.83	1.00	0.76	0.67	0.83	1.22	71	56	53	55	235	1018	74.7
	4	0.77	0.97	1.12	1.05	0.92		0.47	0.67	0.78	0.62	0.60		32	12	12	12	68		
0233	1	5.40	3.28	4.48	3.62	3.81		0.0	4.09	8.20	4.76	5.95		1	62	69	78	210		
	2	2.42	2.98	2.72	2.78	2.78		3.42	5.18	2.52	2.59	3.55		20	58	60	67	205	723/	
	3	1.98	3.02	2.95	3.13	2.73	3.08	1.85	2.31	2.24	2.32	2.21	4.01	69	58	55	56	238	1018	71.0
	4	2.41	3.14	3.81	3.29	2.93		2.49	1.80	1.83	1.92	2.21		34	12	12	12	70		
0240	1	17.91	28.76	31.06	37.40	32.20		7.59	17.47	15.67	20.83	18.40		5	97	97	99	298		
	2	18.38	31.03	33.40	36.12	30.47		9.19	13.51	15.27	16.71	15.48		60	82	83	77	302	1016/	
	3	20.89	26.75	30.14	34.63	26.35	28.96	12.48	12.51	13.96	19.26	15.16	16.34	141	66	61	62	330	1018	99.8
	4	18.80	24.98	28.14	29.50	22.49		11.44	9.96	15.34	9.77	12.32		50	12	12	12	86		

Table 6--Continued

Criterion Variable	Size Type	MEAN 1972	1974	1975	1976	For Size	For entire population	STD DEV 1972	1974	1975	1976	For Size	For entire population	NUMBER OF CASES 1972	1974	1975	1976	For Size	No./ Total	PTC/ Total
0610	1	61.97	50.19	58.31	66.56	58.56		11.86	15.97	20.83	24.21	21.54		5	92	93	97	287		
	2	43.40	38.10	44.72	49.75	43.96		10.02	13.14	15.87	17.05	15.05		58	79	81	75	293	988/	
	3	31.04	34.64	42.56	45.58	36.65	45.05	9.19	9.97	13.21	13.94	12.62	18.76	137	65	60	61	323	1018	97.1
	4	28.42	38.78	44.63	49.32	35.12		7.24	11.41	11.54	11.03	12.51		49	12	12	12	85		
0630	1	36.96	42.34	50.55	58.95	50.44		15.03	22.30	23.67	26.55	25.02		5	96	95	98	294		
	2	23.85	31.73	36.87	41.85	34.14		8.82	16.64	19.10	19.80	17.63		59	81	82	75	297	998/	
	3	17.98	24.25	27.01	31.04	23.31	33.81	7.87	12.90	13.58	15.14	12.69	21.89	139	64	59	60	322	1018	98.0
	4	12.48	15.79	19.52	19.26	14.90		3.90	7.09	8.42	7.65	6.44		49	12	12	12	85		
0640	1	27.22	26.31	34.05	39.41	33.22		8.49	11.68	13.87	12.29	13.65		5	97	97	100	299		
	2	22.40	22.39	27.43	30.98	25.97		9.61	7.11	9.03	10.01	9.17		59	81	82	76	298	1012/	
	3	18.18	17.86	21.63	25.29	20.06	25.45	5.52	6.79	6.52	9.02	7.27	11.49	142	66	60	61	329	1018	99.4
	4	15.49	16.97	19.94	22.12	17.27		5.05	5.01	3.47	3.71	5.27		50	12	12	12	86		
Staff	1	679.27	580.71	660.54	765.75	670.14		128.76	176.66	203.65	187.30	202.47		5	97	97	100	299		
	2	523.07	494.25	581.41	649.04	563.34		99.74	102.85	120.30	129.53	128.74		60	82	82	77	301	1016/	
	3	453.18	480.47	552.02	623.00	508.73	571.25	88.05	95.96	83.28	99.85	111.92	163.56	142	65	61	62	330	1018	99.8
	4	422.75	514.04	594.72	677.85	495.08		52.40	77.39	77.92	73.80	114.43		50	12	12	12	86		

Tables 7A and 7B display data relating to total per pupil expense. Table 7A displays data for all pupil types, all school types, and all size types. Table 7B displays data only for students grouped into grades K - 8. In Table 7A schools are classified into three size types: those with ADM less than 100, those with ADM greater than or equal to 100 but less than 1000, and those with ADM greater than or equal to 1000. In Table 7B schools are classified into two size types: those with ADM less than 133 and those with ADM greater than or equal to 133 but less than 200.

In Table 7A for pupil types one through four, the means, standard deviations, and numbers of cases represent 100 percent of the cases for years 1974-76. The percentage displayed for type five students indicates that not all school districts provide approved kindergartens. Where no size type is given, it can be assumed that the table displays all data pertaining to that pupil and school type.

The first eight lines of Table 7A indicate that the means and standard deviations for the "types" and "entire population" are the same. The next two lines have separate means and standard deviations for high school and graded elementary school district per pupil expenditures for seventh and eighth grade students. These separate statistics are followed by a mean and standard deviation of all seventh and eighth graders who are in either a high school or graded elementary school district. The next three lines are devoted to kindergarten students in high school districts. A separate mean and standard deviation is given for each size type followed by a mean and standard deviation for all kindergarten students in high school districts. The last line displays data for kindergarten students in graded elementary school districts. The mean and standard deviation of per pupil expenditures for operation of plant and equipment for all kindergarten students is given for the last four lines in the table.

Table 7A shows that for students in grades one through six in high school districts the average per pupil expenditure is least for the "middle-sized" schools.

The standard deviation for the "middle-sized" schools is much larger than that of the largest schools.

Table 7B displays per pupil expenditures for operation of plant and equipment for students in grades K - 8 for the year 1972. All school district types and size types are represented. Ninety-two and five-tenths percent of the schools that could have reported data in these categories did so.

Summary

The purpose of this section was to report summary longitudinal data collected, organized, and analyzed by the study group. The descriptions contained were intended to assist readers in comprehending the tables rather than to identify believed interesting or important trends or inferences. Data for the tables were secured from SF01 (clerk's) reports filed with the Department of Public Instruction by the individual districts.

TABLE 7A

TOTAL EXPENSE PER PUPIL

			MEAN						STD DEV						NUMBER OF CASES						
Pupil	School	Size	74	75	76	For Type	School Type	For entire population	74	75	76	For Type	School Type	For entire population	74	75	76	For Type	School Type	For entire population	Percentage Total
1	1 or 2		926.89	1090.49	1225.75	1079.88		1079.88	257.53	275.56	289.71	300.18		300.18	301	298	294			893	100
2	2		955.00	1098.13	1210.59	1087.05		1087.05	341.46	372.00	413.66	387.97		387.97	44	45	43			132	100
2	3		2297.83	1437.77	1344.78	1725.21		1725.21	6521.11	1187.48	575.55	399.74		399.74	30	28	24			82	100
3	1	1	1003.97	1189.31	1339.48	1180.69		1180.69	292.12	333.12	313.93	341.64		341.64	123	127	130			380	100
3	1	2	853.05	1013.14	1125.22	992.07		992.07	163.33	190.70	224.76	223.21		223.21	125	117	112			354	100
3	1	3	837.68	1020.28	1144.69	1000.88		1000.88	132.88	137.47	131.65	182.12		182.12	10	10	10			30	100
3	2	1	972.83	1152.41	1237.91	1121.32		1121.32	355.28	578.40	434.95	475.57		475.57	39	40	39			118	100
3	2	2	893.68	988.96	999.94	958.07		958.07	322.10	191.72	186.68	231.90		231.90	5	5	4			14	100
4	1		922.02	1083.11	1246.48	1082.59	1070.36	1070.36	346.40	341.94	372.51	377.39	404.08	404.08	257	253	251	761	761	893	100
4	2		846.53	1013.86	1141.98	999.82			418.64	560.95	563.58	528.81			44	45	43	132	132		
5	1	1	1618.65	1265.58	1411.66	1396.63			970.52	581.27	847.24	727.74			3	6	6	15			
5	1	2	1170.41	685.75	766.81	828.24	894.11	932.18	614.95	448.79	496.74	537.05	587.21	619.72	18	29	33	80	103	208/1059	19.2
5	1	3	906.77	507.78	525.86	614.31			88.04	2.84	39.21	184.94			2	3	3	8			
5	2	1	2200.22	1553.20	1638.00	1716.53	1716.53		0.0	1241.38	926.23	821.36	821.36		1	2	2	5	5		

Pupil Type
1 = k-8
2 = 1-9
3 = 1-6
4 = 7-8
5 = k

School District Type
1 = High School
2 = Graded Elementary
3 = One Room Rural

Size Type
1 => ADM < 100
2 => 100 ≤ ADM < 1000
3 => ADM ≥ 100

TABLE 7B

TOTAL EXPENSE PER PUPIL

			MEAN			STD DEV			NUMBER OF CASES			
Pupil	School	Size	1972	For Type	For entire population	1972	For Type	For entire population	1972	For Type	For entire population	PTC Total
1	1	1	883.65	758.23		166.77	147.62		53	257		
1	1	2	725.65			123.21			204			
1	2	1	815.51	797.36	869.82	436.49	416.65	1644.65	46	53	345/373	92.5
1	2	2	678.10			237.54			7			
1	3	1	1798.89	1798.89		5093.77	5093.77		35	35		

Pupil Type
1 = k-8

School District Type
1 = High School
2 = Graded Elementary
3 = One Room Rural

Size Type
1 => S < 133
2 => 133 ≤ S < 200

TRANSPORTATION COSTS

Data concerning transportation costs and reimbursement were obtained from the Department of Public Instruction. The costs were those reported by the individual school districts to the Department of Public Instruction. The reimbursement figures are the actual amounts sent to the districts based on data presented by the local school districts.

Tables were prepared to present visually the costs and reimbursements for two counties. The first two counties on the alphabetical list were used. It is not believed that either county is atypical of counties in general. However, it cannot be assumed that either county is typical of the state as a whole. The charts do provide an example of the wide variance in the percentage of the reported costs that are reimbursed by the state.

TABLE 1

TRANSPORTATION COSTS AND REIMBURSEMENTS, ADAMS COUNTY, 1976-77

School District	76-77 Cost	Reimbursement Earned	Percent Reimbursement Is of Cost
Reeder	$ 30,310.45	$ 13,614.92	44.92
Paranto	7,387.20	3,142.96	42.55
Gilstrap	5,990.17	3,240.03	54.09
Hettinger	83,144.02	51,932.96	62.46
Spring Butte	10,362.34	9,381.28	90.53
County Total	$137,194.18	$ 81,312.15	59.27

TABLE 2

TRANSPORTATION COSTS AND REIMBURSEMENTS, BARNES COUNTY, 1976-77

School District	76-77 Cost	Reimbursement Earned	Percent Reimbursement Is of Cost
Valley City	$ 69,793.69	$ 47,319.68	67.80
Oriska	29,890.69*	23,792.04	79.60
Eckelson	601.46	7,888.55	1,311.56
Litchville	47,474.33*	39,195.65	82.56
Fingal	18,871.98	16,690.87	88.44
North Central	72,049.21	46,587.97	64.66
Winbledon	32,356.66*	31,708.10	98.00
Kathryn	32,813.48*	15,695.25	47.72
County Total	$303,851.50	$228,842.11	75.31

*Includes transportation vehicle purchase

The tables provide examples of obvious problems in analysis of transportation costs. It is difficult to believe that Eckelson earned $7,888.55 in reimbursement while incurring only $601.46 in costs.

The costs of Wimbledon and Kathryn appear to be nearly the same but the reimbursements vary greatly. If neither school had purchased a transportation vehicle, Wimbledon would have spent $24,856.66 and Kathryn would have spent $20,000.46. Wimbledon would have been reimbursed at 127.56 percent of costs and Kathryn at 78.29 percent of costs. Replacement vehicles cannot be removed from the calculations because those districts which contract for services are paying for vehicle purchases in their contract in an indirect way.

Some of the other problems discerned during the course of the study include:

1. Not all costs are reported for each district. For instance, salaries of employees doing other tasks for the districts but also driving buses may not be prorated accurately or prorated at all.
2. Some of the costs included may belong in other areas such as extra-curricular activities or field trips.
3. Other income received for transportation support is not included in the data.

It is obvious that a system of providing accurate data must be obtained if accurate comparisons or conclusions are to be made.

If the figures are accurate to any reasonable degree, it is also obvious that some districts must spend much of the general fund levy to get the students to and from school while others spend little, if any, of their general fund levy for transportation.

The study team quite literally "gave up" on its stated intention to analyze transportation costs.

LONGITUDINAL ACCREDITATION DATA

This section summarizes data which were collected regarding the accreditation criteria for North Dakota schools. The data are based on information taken from the Department of Public Instruction's annual classification letters for elementary and secondary schools. From these criteria, thirty-two items were selected for the elementary schools and thirty-four items were selected for the secondary schools. The selected items are identified in Tables 1 and 7. The items were available for each of the five data years and, consequently, permitted identifying trends.

The remaining tables provide summaries of accreditation data for the years 1972 through 1977. In all tables, the figures represent the percentage of schools that were in compliance with the corresponding accreditation standards.

Elementary schools' accreditation compliance data were broken down by the type of school district: elementary schools in high school districts, graded elementary schools, and one-room rural elementary schools. High schools' accreditation compliance data were broken down by size, based on enrollment.

Table 2 presents compliance by elementary schools, by type of district, for the years 1972 and 1976. Table 3 is based on the data in Table 2. It shows the change in the percentage of schools in compliance from 1972 to 1976.

Tables 4, 5, and 6 summarize the compliance data for all five years, each table presenting data for elementary schools in one type of district.

Table 8 shows the percentage of high schools that were in compliance with state accreditation standards during the years 1972 and 1976. These data are broken down by the size of schools, based on high school enrollments.

Tables 9 through 13 summarize high schools' compliance, by size of school, for each year, 1972 through 1976. The remaining tables, 14 through 17, show the trends in

compliance throughout the period, each table providing data on one size category.

The data indicate some general trends. First, elementary schools in high school districts have consistently improved their ability to comply with North Dakota accreditation standards. Second, graded elementary schools' compliance has fluctuated throughout the five-year period, showing a slight net decrease in ability to comply with the standards. Finally, one-room rural elementary schools have shown a consistent decline in their ability to meet the accreditation standards.

The compliance rates of high schools have fluctuated during the period 1972-76, with all size categories indicating a net increase in the percentage of schools in compliance. The schools below 150 enrollment have shown slightly larger net gains in compliance with the accreditation standards than have schools in the larger size categories. But this may be misleading since the two largest size categories began the period with average compliance in excess of 95 percent. Schools in the 75-149 size category improved their compliance to an average of 95.3 percent at the end of the period. But schools below 75 enrollment increased their compliance average to only 86.4 percent.

The data are based on a random sample of districts. The sample was drawn in such a way that a sufficient number of items appear in each size and type category to satisfy typical statistical standards for adequacy of sample size.

TABLE 1

IDENTIFICATION OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ACCREDITATION ITEMS

1.	Elementary principal - qualifications
2.	Elementary principal - time for supervision
3.	Pupil-teacher ratio
4.	Written goals and objectives
5.	Handbooks: Teachers'
6.	Handbooks: Students'/Parents'
7.	Policy: New and replacement teachers
8.	Contract renewal - inservice and course requirements
9.	Recent college preparation
10.	Language arts - texts
11.	Language arts - sequence
12.	Math - texts
13.	Math - sequence
14.	Music - all grades
15.	Music - minutes per week
16.	Physical education - instructional sequence
17.	Physical education - minutes per week
18.	Reading - texts
19.	Reading - sequence
20.	Science - texts
21.	Social studies - texts
22.	Usage of evaluative instruments - aptitude
23.	Usage of evaluative instruments - achievement
24.	Usage of evaluative instruments - diagnostic
25.	Media services - centralized
26.	Media services budget - books and periodicals
27.	Media services budget - audiovisual materials
28.	Size of book collection
29.	Cataloging - books
30.	Cataloging - audiovisual materials
31.	Librarian - qualifications
32.	Librarian - schedule

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGE OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN COMPLIANCE WITH ACCREDITATION CRITERIA FOR THE YEARS 1972 AND 1976

Item	All Types		Elementary Schools in High School Districts		Graded Elementary Schools		One-Room Rural Schools	
	1972	1976	1972	1976	1972	1976	1972	1976
1	71.5	75.0	67.8	74.0	69.6	56.5	87.5	62.5
2	81.0	87.5	71.1	80.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
3	51.1	62.5	67.8	82.0	39.1	39.1	0.0	12.5
4	53.3	53.7	66.7	62.9	34.8	43.5	20.8	29.2
5	74.5	79.4	88.9	95.5	39.1	43.5	54.2	54.2
6	60.6	75.7	80.0	92.1	26.1	56.5	20.8	33.3
7	86.9	85.3	91.1	89.9	87.0	60.9	70.8	91.7
8	50.4	55.9	58.9	66.3	43.5	56.5	25.0	16.7
9	31.4	35.3	20.0	25.8	52.2	30.4	54.2	75.0
10	92.0	88.2	95.6	89.9	87.0	87.0	83.3	83.3
11	88.3	80.9	91.1	84.3	82.6	65.2	83.3	83.3
12	94.9	95.6	98.9	96.6	87.0	91.3	87.5	95.8
13	86.1	91.2	90.0	95.5	69.6	78.3	87.5	87.5
14	94.2	96.3	93.3	96.6	95.7	95.7	95.8	95.8
15	38.0	53.7	43.3	57.3	34.8	39.1	20.8	54.2
16	49.6	88.2	53.3	88.8	56.5	87.0	29.2	87.5
17	42.3	59.6	44.4	60.7	47.8	39.1	29.2	75.0
18	95.6	89.0	97.8	95.5	91.3	87.0	91.7	66.7
19	87.6	89.0	88.9	93.3	91.3	87.0	79.2	75.0
20	80.3	82.4	83.3	85.4	73.9	82.6	75.0	70.8
21	75.2	75.0	80.0	76.4	69.6	78.3	62.5	66.7
22	47.4	52.9	56.7	66.3	30.4	39.1	29.2	16.7
23	98.5	95.6	100.0	98.9	100.0	95.7	91.7	83.3
24	38.0	56.6	48.9	71.9	8.7	21.7	25.0	33.3
25	58.4	52.9	52.2	67.4	43.5	30.4	95.8	20.8
26	73.7	74.3	84.4	83.1	69.6	65.2	37.5	50.0
27	57.7	58.1	70.0	70.8	34.8	47.8	33.3	20.8
28	75.2	72.8	78.9	88.8	73.9	60.9	62.5	25.0
29	50.4	50.0	41.1	66.3	47.8	26.1	87.5	12.5
30	47.4	51.5	41.1	68.5	39.1	30.4	79.2	8.3
31	50.4	44.1	44.4	61.8	30.4	8.7	91.7	12.5
32	36.5	23.5	25.6	32.6	30.4	8.7	83.3	4.2
Mean	66.2	69.7	69.2	77.1	59.0	57.5	61.7	53.3

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGE OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, INCREASE OR DECREASE, IN COMPLIANCE WITH ACCREDITATION STANDARDS FROM 1972 TO 1976

Item	All Types	Elementary Schools in High School Districts	Graded Elementary Schools	One-Room Rural Schools
1	3.5	6.2	(13.1)	(25.0)
2	6.5	9.8	0.0	0.0
3	11.4	14.2	0.0	12.5
4	0.4	(3.8)	8.7	8.4
5	4.9	6.6	4.4	0.0
6	15.1	12.1	30.4	12.5
7	(1.6)	(1.2)	(26.1)	20.9
8	5.5	7.4	13.0	(8.3)
9	3.9	5.8	(21.8)	20.8
10	(3.8)	(5.7)	0.0	0.0
11	(7.4)	(6.8)	(17.4)	0.0
12	0.7	(2.3)	4.3	8.3
13	5.1	5.5	8.7	0.0
14	2.1	3.3	0.0	0.0
15	15.7	14.0	4.3	33.4
16	38.6	35.5	30.5	58.3
17	17.3	16.3	(8.7)	45.8
18	(6.6)	(2.3)	(4.3)	(25.0)
19	1.4	4.4	(4.3)	(4.2)
20	2.1	2.1	8.7	(4.2)
21	(0.2)	(3.6)	8.7	4.2
22	5.5	9.6	8.7	(12.5)
23	(2.9)	(1.1)	(4.3)	(8.4)
24	18.6	23.0	13.0	8.3
25	(5.5)	15.2	(13.1)	(75.0)
26	0.6	(1.3)	(4.4)	12.5
27	0.4	0.8	13.0	(12.5)
28	(2.4)	9.9	(13.0)	(37.5)
29	(0.4)	25.2	(21.7)	(75.0)
30	4.1	27.4	(8.7)	(70.9)
31	(6.3)	17.4	(21.7)	(79.2)
32	(13.0)	7.0	(21.7)	(79.1)
Mean	3.5	7.8	(1.5)	(8.5)

NOTE: Those percentages in parentheses are decreases.

TABLE 4

PERCENTAGE OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN COMPLIANCE WITH ACCREDITATION CRITERIA, 1972-1976

Item	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
1	67.8	71.4	69.6	74.7	83.1
2	71.1	70.3	73.9	80.2	80.9
3	67.8	73.6	76.1	81.3	82.0
4	66.7	35.2	42.4	52.7	62.9
5	88.9	93.4	94.6	95.6	95.5
6	80.0	92.3	89.1	95.6	92.1
7	91.1	98.9	82.6	85.7	89.9
8	58.9	60.4	65.2	67.0	66.3
9	20.0	18.7	29.3	18.7	25.8
10	95.6	95.6	89.1	95.6	89.9
11	91.1	92.3	88.0	90.1	84.3
12	98.9	98.9	95.7	95.6	96.6
13	90.0	95.6	92.4	96.7	95.5
14	93.3	96.7	96.7	98.9	96.6
15	43.3	41.8	43.5	49.5	57.3
16	53.3	76.9	78.3	85.7	88.8
17	44.4	49.5	41.3	51.6	60.7
18	97.8	94.5	94.6	94.5	95.5
19	88.9	92.3	92.4	92.3	93.3
20	83.3	89.0	84.8	85.7	85.4
21	80.0	78.0	81.5	81.3	76.4
22	56.7	54.9	55.4	61.5	66.3
23	100.0	98.9	100.0	100.0	98.9
24	48.9	75.8	81.5	67.0	71.9
25	52.2	60.4	58.7	61.5	67.4
26	84.4	85.7	83.7	76.9	83.1
27	70.0	62.6	70.7	71.4	70.8
28	78.9	83.5	87.0	87.9	88.8
29	41.1	37.4	38.0	63.7	66.3
30	41.1	49.5	42.4	71.4	68.5
31	44.4	46.2	52.2	54.9	61.8
32	25.6	28.6	25.0	35.2	32.6
Mean	69.3	71.8	71.7	75.6	77.4

TABLE 5

PERCENTAGE OF GRADED ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN COMPLIANCE WITH ACCREDITATION CRITERIA, 1972–1976

Item	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
1	69.6	65.2	69.6	47.8	56.5
2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
3	39.1	47.8	43.5	39.1	39.1
4	34.8	39.1	39.1	39.1	43.5
5	39.1	56.5	56.5	60.9	43.5
6	26.1	56.5	56.5	52.2	56.5
7	87.0	95.6	100.0	65.2	60.9
8	43.5	47.8	43.5	60.9	56.5
9	52.2	30.4	34.8	39.1	30.4
10	87.0	95.7	87.0	91.3	87.0
11	82.6	91.3	65.2	73.9	65.2
12	87.0	87.0	82.6	91.3	91.3
13	69.6	95.7	82.6	87.0	78.3
14	95.7	91.3	82.6	91.3	95.7
15	34.8	34.8	43.5	30.4	39.1
16	56.5	78.3	82.6	91.3	87.0
17	47.8	43.5	26.1	52.2	39.1
18	91.3	95.7	78.3	78.3	87.0
19	91.3	91.3	82.6	82.6	87.0
20	73.9	82.6	82.6	87.0	82.6
21	69.6	87.0	69.6	73.9	78.3
22	30.4	43.5	43.5	39.1	39.1
23	100.0	95.7	95.7	95.7	95.7
24	8.7	52.2	60.9	26.1	21.7
25	43.5	39.1	26.1	34.8	30.4
26	69.6	60.9	52.2	60.9	65.2
27	34.8	30.4	34.8	56.5	47.8
28	73.9	47.8	43.5	56.5	60.9
29	47.8	26.1	21.7	30.4	26.1
30	39.1	30.4	21.7	34.8	30.4
31	30.4	17.4	17.4	8.7	8.7
32	30.4	30.4	17.4	17.4	8.7
Mean	59.0	62.1	57.6	59.2	57.5

TABLE 6

PERCENTAGE OF ONE-ROOM RURAL SCHOOLS IN COMPLIANCE WITH ACCREDITATION CRITERIA, 1972-1976

Item	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
1	87.5	95.8	75.0	50.0	62.5
2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4	20.8	25.0	33.3	29.2	29.2
5	54.2	50.0	41.7	41.7	54.2
6	20.8	25.0	25.0	33.3	33.3
7	70.8	79.2	95.8	95.8	91.7
8	25.0	29.2	16.7	16.7	16.7
9	54.2	58.3	62.5	58.3	75.0
10	83.3	91.7	83.3	79.2	83.3
11	83.3	95.8	79.2	87.5	83.3
12	87.5	100.0	79.2	87.5	95.8
13	87.5	91.7	83.3	91.7	87.5
14	95.8	100.0	95.8	91.7	95.8
15	20.8	45.8	29.2	33.3	54.2
16	29.2	75.0	79.2	87.5	87.5
17	29.2	66.7	54.2	66.7	75.0
18	91.7	79.2	62.5	87.5	66.7
19	79.2	83.3	83.3	91.7	75.0
20	75.0	75.0	79.2	87.5	70.8
21	62.5	66.7	66.7	83.3	66.7
22	29.2	33.3	29.2	37.5	16.7
23	91.7	95.8	91.7	87.5	83.3
24	25.0	45.8	37.5	12.5	33.3
25	95.8	95.8	50.0	29.2	20.8
26	37.5	45.8	54.2	45.8	50.0
27	33.3	20.8	12.5	29.2	20.8
28	62.5	45.8	25.0	25.0	25.0
29	87.5	100.0	25.0	20.8	12.5
30	79.2	87.5	12.5	8.3	8.3
31	91.7	95.8	50.0	4.2	12.5
32	83.3	95.8	50.0	16.7	4.2
Mean	61.7	68.6	55.1	53.7	53.3

TABLE 7

IDENTIFICATION OF HIGH SCHOOL ACCREDITATION ITEMS

1.	Superintendent - qualifications
2.	Secondary principal - qualifications
3.	Average daily attendance - grades 9-12
4.	Library and audiovisual budget
5.	Library and audiovisual collection
6.	Librarian - qualifications
7.	Librarian - schedule
8.	Science - student experiment stations
9.	Physical science
10.	Biology
11.	Chemistry
12.	Physics
13.	Physical education - facilities
14.	Physical education - class periods
15.	Guidance - accumulated records
16.	Counselor - qualifications
17.	Standardized tests
18.	Written school board policies
19.	Supervision
20.	Days of classroom instruction
21.	Bond for administrators
22.	Fireproof storage
23.	Current inventories
24.	Classroom space
25.	Ventilation, heating, and lighting
26.	Lavatory facilities
27.	Class periods
28.	Class size
29.	Balanced curriculum
30.	Minimum legal curriculum
31.	Teachers - first grade professional certificates
32.	Teachers - preparation/assignments
33.	Meeting needs of students
34.	Growth and improvement

TABLE 8

PERCENTAGE OF HIGH SCHOOLS IN COMPLIANCE WITH ACCREDITATION CRITERIA BY SIZE FOR THE YEARS 1972 AND 1976

Item	0-74		75-149		150-549		550 +	
	1972	1976	1972	1976	1972	1976	1972	1976
1	52.6	58.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2	66.7	95.7	86.4	85.7	100.0	95.8	100.0	100.0
3	100.0	87.5	90.5	85.0	96.0	91.7	100.0	100.0
4	84.2	87.5	95.5	81.0	96.0	92.0	80.0	100.0
5	94.7	100.0	86.4	95.5	68.0	88.0	100.0	100.0
6	47.4	56.0	86.4	90.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
7	72.2	48.0	90.9	95.5	100.0	95.8	100.0	100.0
8	100.0	100.0	100.0	95.2	95.7	100.0	100.0	100.0
9	100.0	95.8	100.0	100.0	96.0	95.8	100.0	100.0
10	94.7	91.7	100.0	100.0	84.0	92.0	100.0	100.0
11	100.0	95.7	100.0	100.0	88.0	92.0	100.0	100.0
12	94.4	87.0	90.9	100.0	96.0	96.0	100.0	100.0
13	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	96.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
14	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
15	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	96.0	100.0	100.0
16	15.8	48.0	33.3	54.5	66.7	88.0	100.0	100.0
17	94.7	96.0	100.0	95.5	100.0	91.7	100.0	85.7
18	100.0	96.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
19	84.2	88.0	90.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
20	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
21	100.0	96.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
22	89.5	88.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	80.0	100.0
23	94.7	96.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
24	89.5	92.0	90.9	90.9	83.3	92.0	100.0	100.0
25	100.0	96.0	95.5	100.0	95.8	100.0	80.0	100.0
26	94.7	92.0	100.0	95.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
27	94.7	96.0	81.0	100.0	95.8	96.0	100.0	100.0
28	100.0	100.0	90.9	90.9	79.2	96.0	100.0	100.0
29	10.5	44.0	76.2	90.5	100.0	96.0	100.0	100.0
30	78.9	96.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
31	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
32	78.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	95.8	100.0	100.0
33	33.3	45.8	100.0	95.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
34	61.1	64.0	95.0	100.0	100.0	95.0	100.0	100.0
Mean	83.2	86.4	93.5	95.3	95.2	96.6	98.2	99.6

TABLE 9

PERCENTAGE OF HIGH SCHOOLS IN COMPLIANCE WITH ACCREDITATION CRITERIA BY SIZE, 1972

Item	0-74	75-149	150-549	550+
1	52.6	100.0	100.0	100.0
2	66.7	86.4	100.0	100.0
3	100.0	90.5	96.0	100.0
4	84.2	95.5	96.0	80.0
5	94.7	86.4	68.0	100.0
6	47.4	86.4	100.0	100.0
7	72.2	90.9	100.0	100.0
8	100.0	100.0	95.7	100.0
9	100.0	100.0	96.0	100.0
10	94.7	100.0	84.0	100.0
11	100.0	100.0	88.0	100.0
12	94.4	90.9	96.0	100.0
13	100.0	100.0	96.0	100.0
14	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
15	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
16	15.8	33.3	66.7	100.0
17	94.7	100.0	100.0	100.0
18	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
19	84.2	90.5	100.0	100.0
20	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
21	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
22	89.5	100.0	100.0	80.0
23	94.7	100.0	100.0	100.0
24	89.5	90.9	83.3	100.0
25	100.0	95.5	95.8	80.0
26	94.7	100.0	100.0	100.0
27	94.7	81.0	95.8	100.0
28	100.0	90.9	79.2	100.0
29	10.5	76.2	100.0	100.0
30	78.9	100.0	100.0	100.0
31	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
32	78.9	100.0	100.0	100.0
33	33.3	100.0	100.0	100.0
34	61.1	95.0	100.0	100.0
Mean	83.2	93.5	95.2	98.2

TABLE 10

PERCENTAGE OF HIGH SCHOOLS IN COMPLIANCE WITH ACCREDITATION CRITERIA BY SIZE, 1973

Item	0-74	75-149	150-549	550+
1	63.6	100.0	100.0	100.0
2	66.7	86.4	100.0	100.0
3	100.0	90.5	96.0	100.0
4	86.4	83.3	87.5	50.0
5	94.7	87.5	79.2	71.4
6	45.5	95.7	100.0	100.0
7	66.7	95.8	87.5	100.0
8	100.0	100.0	95.8	100.0
9	100.0	95.8	95.8	100.0
10	90.9	95.8	87.5	100.0
11	90.9	95.8	91.7	100.0
12	90.5	95.7	91.7	100.0
13	100.0	100.0	95.8	100.0
14	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
15	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
16	18.2	33.3	78.3	100.0
17	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
18	95.2	100.0	95.8	100.0
19	81.8	100.0	100.0	100.0
20	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
21	95.5	100.0	100.0	100.0
22	90.9	100.0	100.0	100.0
23	95.5	100.0	100.0	100.0
24	86.4	91.7	82.6	100.0
25	100.0	95.8	91.7	100.0
26	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
27	100.0	95.0	100.0	100.0
28	100.0	91.3	95.5	100.0
29	27.3	82.6	100.0	100.0
30	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
31	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
32	100.0	100.0	95.0	100.0
33	38.9	100.0	100.0	100.0
34	95.2	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean	85.9	94.5	95.5	97.7

TABLE 11

PERCENTAGE OF HIGH SCHOOLS IN COMPLIANCE WITH ACCREDITATION CRITERIA BY SIZE, 1974

Item	0-74	75-149	150-549	550+
1	52.4	100.0	100.0	100.0
2	76.5	96.3	95.7	100.0
3	100.0	100.0	95.8	100.0
4	81.0	92.3	75.0	85.7
5	100.0	92.6	83.3	100.0
6	45.0	92.6	95.8	100.0
7	52.4	96.2	100.0	100.0
8	100.0	100.0	87.0	100.0
9	95.2	100.0	95.8	100.0
10	90.5	100.0	87.5	100.0
11	95.2	96.3	91.7	100.0
12	90.5	96.3	91.7	100.0
13	100.0	100.0	95.7	100.0
14	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
15	100.0	96.3	100.0	100.0
16	9.5	44.4	78.3	100.0
17	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
18	95.0	100.0	91.7	100.0
19	90.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
20	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
21	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
22	81.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
23	95.2	100.0	100.0	100.0
24	81.0	92.6	87.0	100.0
25	100.0	100.0	95.8	100.0
26	95.2	96.3	100.0	100.0
27	100.0	88.0	83.3	100.0
28	100.0	100.0	91.3	100.0
29	14.3	81.5	100.0	100.0
30	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
31	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
32	100.0	100.0	95.7	100.0
33	30.0	96.3	100.0	100.0
34	95.2	96.0	100.0	100.0
Mean	84.3	95.7	94.7	99.6

TABLE 12

PERCENTAGE OF HIGH SCHOOLS IN COMPLIANCE WITH ACCREDITATION CRITERIA BY SIZE, 1975

Item	0-74	75-149	150-549	550+
1	64.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2	91.3	95.2	100.0	100.0
3	100.0	94.7	95.8	100.0
4	96.0	81.0	84.6	85.7
5	92.0	95.2	84.6	100.0
6	44.0	90.5	92.3	100.0
7	45.8	89.5	96.0	100.0
8	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
9	96.0	100.0	92.3	100.0
10	91.7	100.0	84.6	100.0
11	88.0	100.0	92.3	100.0
12	83.3	100.0	92.3	100.0
13	92.0	90.5	100.0	100.0
14	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
15	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
16	36.0	57.1	80.8	100.0
17	95.8	100.0	100.0	100.0
18	92.0	100.0	96.2	100.0
19	88.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
20	100.0	95.2	100.0	100.0
21	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
22	88.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
23	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
24	84.0	95.2	100.0	100.0
25	96.0	100.0	96.2	100.0
26	92.0	95.2	100.0	100.0
27	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
28	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
29	40.0	81.0	100.0	100.0
30	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
31	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
32	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
33	38.1	100.0	100.0	100.0
34	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean	86.3	95.9	97.0	99.6

TABLE 13

PERCENTAGE OF HIGH SCHOOLS IN COMPLIANCE WITH ACCREDITATION CRITERIA BY SIZE, 1976

Item	0-74	75-149	150-549	550+
1	58.3	100.0	100.0	100.0
2	95.7	85.7	95.8	100.0
3	87.5	85.0	91.7	100.0
4	87.5	81.0	92.0	100.0
5	100.0	95.5	88.0	100.0
6	56.0	90.9	100.0	100.0
7	48.0	95.5	95.8	100.0
8	100.0	95.2	100.0	100.0
9	95.8	100.0	95.8	100.0
10	91.7	100.0	92.0	100.0
11	95.7	100.0	92.0	100.0
12	87.0	100.0	96.0	100.0
13	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
14	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
15	100.0	100.0	96.0	100.0
16	48.0	54.5	88.0	100.0
17	96.0	95.5	91.7	85.7
18	96.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
19	88.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
20	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
21	96.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
22	88.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
23	96.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
24	92.0	90.9	92.0	100.0
25	96.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
26	92.0	95.5	100.0	100.0
27	96.0	100.0	96.0	100.0
28	100.0	90.9	96.0	100.0
29	44.0	90.5	96.0	100.0
30	96.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
31	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
32	100.0	100.0	95.8	100.0
33	45.8	95.2	100.0	100.0
34	64.0	100.0	95.0	100.0
Mean	86.4	95.3	96.6	99.6

TABLE 14

PERCENTAGE OF HIGH SCHOOLS (SIZE 0-74) IN COMPLIANCE WITH ACCREDITATION CRITERIA, 1972-1976

Item	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
1	52.6	63.6	52.4	64.0	58.3
2	66.7	66.7	76.5	91.3	95.7
3	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	87.5
4	84.2	86.4	81.0	96.0	87.5
5	94.7	94.7	100.0	92.0	100.0
6	47.4	45.	45.0	44.0	56.0
7	72.2	66.7	52.4	45.8	48.0
8	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
9	100.0	100.0	95.2	96.0	95.8
10	94.7	90.9	90.5	91.7	91.7
11	100.0	90.9	95.2	88.0	95.7
12	94.4	90.5	90.5	83.3	87.0
13	100.0	100.0	100.0	92.0	100.0
14	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
15	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
16	15.8	18.2	9.5	36.0	48.0
17	94.7	100.0	100.0	95.8	96.0
18	100.0	95.2	95.0	92.0	96.0
19	84.2	81.8	90.0	88.0	88.0
20	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
21	100.0	95.5	100.0	100.0	96.0
22	89.5	90.9	81.0	88.0	88.0
23	94.7	95.5	95.2	100.0	96.0
24	89.5	86.4	81.0	84.0	92.0
25	100.0	100.0	100.0	96.0	96.0
26	94.7	100.0	95.2	92.0	92.0
27	94.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	96.0
28	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
29	10.5	27.3	14.3	40.0	44.0
30	78.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	96.0
31	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
32	78.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
33	33.3	38.9	30.0	38.1	45.8
34	61.1	95.2	95.2	100.0	64.0
Mean	83.2	85.9	84.3	86.3	86.4

TABLE 15

PERCENTAGE OF HIGH SCHOOLS (SIZE 75-149) IN COMPLIANCE WITH ACCREDITATION CRITERIA, 1972-1976

Item	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2	86.4	86.4	96.3	95.2	85.7
3	90.5	90.5	100.0	94.7	85.0
4	95.5	83.3	92.3	81.0	81.0
5	86.4	87.5	92.6	95.2	95.5
6	86.4	95.7	92.6	90.5	90.9
7	90.9	95.8	96.2	89.5	95.5
8	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	95.2
9	100.0	95.8	100.0	100.0	100.0
10	100.0	95.8	100.0	100.0	100.0
11	100.0	95.8	96.3	100.0	100.0
12	90.9	95.7	96.3	100.0	100.0
13	100.0	100.0	100.0	90.5	100.0
14	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
15	100.0	100.0	96.3	100.0	100.0
16	33.3	33.3	44.4	57.1	54.5
17	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	95.5
18	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
19	90.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
20	100.0	100.0	100.0	95.2	100.0
21	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
22	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
23	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
24	90.9	91.7	92.6	95.2	90.9
25	95.5	95.8	100.0	100.0	100.0
26	100.0	100.0	96.3	95.2	95.5
27	81.0	95.0	88.0	100.0	100.0
28	90.9	91.3	100.0	100.0	90.9
29	76.2	82.6	81.5	81.0	90.5
30	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
31	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
32	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
33	100.0	100.0	96.3	100.0	95.2
34	95.0	100.0	96.0	100.0	100.0
Mean	93.5	94.5	95.7	95.9	95.3

TABLE 16

PERCENTAGE OF HIGH SCHOOLS (SIZE 150-549) IN COMPLIANCE WITH ACCREDITATION CRITERIA, 1972-1976

Item	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2	100.0	100.0	95.7	100.0	95.8
3	96.0	96.0	95.8	95.8	91.7
4	96.0	87.5	75.0	84.6	92.0
5	68.0	79.2	83.3	84.6	88.0
6	100.0	100.0	95.8	92.3	100.0
7	100.0	87.5	100.0	96.0	95.8
8	95.7	95.8	87.0	100.0	100.0
9	96.0	95.8	95.8	92.3	95.8
10	84.0	87.5	87.5	84.6	92.0
11	88.0	91.7	91.7	92.3	92.0
12	96.0	91.7	91.7	92.3	96.0
13	96.0	95.8	95.7	100.0	100.0
14	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
15	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	96.0
16	66.7	78.3	78.3	80.8	88.0
17	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	91.7
18	100.0	95.8	91.7	96.2	100.0
19	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
20	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
21	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
22	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
23	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
24	83.3	82.6	87.0	100.0	92.0
25	95.8	91.7	95.8	96.2	100.0
26	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
27	95.8	100.0	83.3	100.0	96.0
28	79.2	95.5	91.3	100.0	96.0
29	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	96.0
30	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
31	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
32	100.0	95.0	95.7	100.0	95.8
33	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
34	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	95.0
Mean	95.2	95.5	94.7	97.0	96.6

TABLE 17

PERCENTAGE OF HIGH SCHOOLS (SIZE 550 AND LARGER) IN COMPLIANCE WITH ACCREDITATION CRITERIA, 1972-1976

Item	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
3	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
4	80.0	50.0	85.7	85.7	100.0
5	100.0	71.4	100.0	100.0	100.0
6	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
7	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
8	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
10	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
11	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
12	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
13	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
14	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
15	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
16	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
17	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	85.7
18	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
19	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
20	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
21	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
22	80.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
23	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
24	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
25	80.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
26	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
27	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
28	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
29	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
30	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
31	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
32	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
33	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
34	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean	98.2	97.7	99.6	99.6	99.6

COURSE OFFERINGS

The study group secured, considered, and displayed data relating to numbers of courses offered. A "course" was regarded as an instructional unit--a "Carnegie unit" for which one "credit" was granted. (The Administrative Manual 1973 for North Dakota Schools, on page 162 states: "High school credit . . . shall be on the basis of one unit for 180 class periods with a minimum of 40 minutes for non-laboratory courses and 55 minutes for laboratory courses. . . . For schools with different schedules, 120 clock hours is required for non-laboratory courses for one unit of credit. The minimum for laboratory subjects is 150 clock hours. . . . ") This method of counting eventuated in frequent "quarter" and "half" units of credit for quarter or semester courses.

State statute prescribes a "minimum curriculum" to receive accreditation. The law is here quoted in its entirety:

> The following units of study shall be made available to all students in each high school in this state at least once during each four-year period if such high school is to receive any accreditation by the department of public instruction:
> 1. English, four units
> 2. Mathematics, three units
> 3. Science, four units
> 4. Social Studies, three units
> 5. Health and Physical Education, one unit
> 6. Music, one unit
> 7. Any combination of the following course areas: business education, foreign language, industrial arts, vocational education, six units. For purposes of this subsection vocational education shall include home economics, agriculture, office education, distributive education, trade industrial, technical, and health occupations.
>
> Each high school may count for accreditation purposes vocational education courses which are offered through cooperative arrangements approved by the state board of vocational education. (Source: NDCC [15-41-24])

Numbers, and more particularly variety, of courses are sometimes regarded as a proxy for opportunity. Accordingly, it seemed useful to secure and consider the data. Data were grouped by size categories based on high school enrollments in 1976-77.

All size categories, on the average, made gains over the five year period; however, the least gain was manifest where programs were most meager initially--in the

smallest size category. Another characteristic of the data should be noted: considerable within-size-category variations can be discerned. Clearly, sincere attempts are being made to expand the number of courses, the varieties of opportunity, available to North Dakota high school students. Still another characteristic of the data should be noted: there are districts which are losing courses. Sometimes, but not always, that loss trend was similar to a declining enrollment trend (and, one can infer, a declining number of staff numbers).

Since the declining enrollment phenomenon is likely to "hit" many high schools with greatest impact after 1980, the maintenance of opportunity will prove even more difficult in the near future for districts with low enrollments.

TABLE 1

COURSE OFFERINGS IN NORTH DAKOTA HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICTS

(1972-73 through 1976-77)

District Name	Co. No.	Dist. No.	Plant No.	Enroll 76-77	Course Offerings 72-73	73-74	74-75	75-76	76-77
Pisek	50	071	7098	24	16.25	16.50	15.75	29.75	16.75
Epping	53	088	2453	25	13.75	14.25	13.75	14.75	12.25
Tolley	38	025	8501	26	14.75	15.25	14.75	15.75	14.00
Cathay	52	003	1319	26	15.50	16.00	15.25	16.25	13.75
Grace City	16	016	3226	28	13.75	17.25	17.75	18.25	17.75
Balfour	25	056	0795	29	21.25	17.00	17.25	14.25	17.75
Fullerton	11	037	2959	30	15.25	16.00	15.25	15.25	17.25
Palermo	31	083	6895	30	16.75	16.25	17.75	18.75	18.75
Hampden	36	034	3412	30	15.50	17.25	15.50	16.25	16.25
Pettibone	22	011	7025	31	17.25	21.75	19.75	19.25	17.75
Deering	25	037	1796	31	13.25	14.25	13.25	12.25	14.75
Braddock	15	007	1055	32	14.75	18.25	17.75	16.25	18.75

Table 1--Continued

District Name	Co. No.	Dist. No.	Plant No.	Enroll 76-77	Course Offerings 72-73	73-74	74-75	75-76	76-77
Zap	29	014	9831	32	17.75	18.75	16.25	18.75	18.25
Almont	30	008	0349	32	15.50	16.00	18.75	13.25	16.00
Hurdsfield	52	035	3831	32	15.50	16.75	18.50	16.50	14.50
Nekoma	10	036	6008	33	18.25	18.00	21.25	26.75	17.25
Monango	11	038	5786	33	17.25	17.50	17.00	18.25	19.75
Courtenay	47	024	1580	33	16.25	16.50	17.75	18.75	21.00
Jud	23	005	4758	34	16.00	17.25	17.25	16.75	16.25
Flaxton	07	035	2859	35	15.50	17.75	16.25	19.25	19.75
Alamo	53	064	0306	35	16.25	16.75	16.25	17.25	16.75
Oberon	03	016	6226	36	20.25	19.75	21.75	19.75	14.75
Dodge	13	008	1881	36	19.25	17.75	17.25	16.75	15.25
Lankin	50	039	5156	36	17.00	17.25	11.75	16.25	14.25
Donnybrook	51	024	1894	36	17.75	15.75	20.75	21.75	14.25
Mapleton	09	007	5479	37	20.75	21.50	19.25	21.00	20.75
Churchs Ferry	36	004	1412	37	16.25	13.25	14.50	29.25	14.25
Pingree	47	010	7087	37	13.75	16.75	17.25	15.25	19.25
Woodworth	47	030	9525	37	18.50	20.25	19.25	22.75	23.25
Forbes	11	042	2887	38	17.50	17.50	15.25	15.25	15.25
Balta	35	007	0798	38	17.25	16.75	16.75	16.25	20.25
Luverne	46	018	5376	38	14.75	15.25	15.25	25.25	16.75
Buchanan	47	011	1144	38	16.00	18.50	17.25	18.25	16.25
Wildrose	53	091	9409	38	18.75	18.75	19.75	16.75	17.75
Kathryn	02	093	4833	39	14.00	18.00	14.75	15.75	14.75
Souris	05	029	8046	40	19.50	21.00	17.00	20.75	17.75

Table 1--Continued

District Name	Co. No.	Dist. No.	Plant No.	Enroll 76-77	Course Offerings 72-73	73-74	74-75	75-76	76-77
Alsen	10	002	0355	40	16.25	19.00	17.25	18.50	15.75
East Central (Egeland)	48	012	2037	40	18.75	18.75	18.75	18.25	17.25
Robinson	22	014	7487	41	17.25	16.75	16.47	17.75	17.75
Driscoll	08	036	1932	42	17.75	17.25	15.75	15.75	14.25
Osnabrock	10	001	6674	42	17.25	17.25	17.25	16.75	18.25
Hannah	10	024	3448	43	14.25	18.50	19.25	20.25	22.25
Leonard	09	054	5217	45	17.25	19.25	19.75	18.25	18.75
Cleveland	47	028	1450	46	16.25	18.75	20.25	21.25	20.75
Newburg	05	048	6043	47	20.25	20.25	21.25	20.25	22.50
Maxbass	05	028	5515	48	16.75	14.75	16.50	17.25	15.75
Lansford	05	035	5159	48	19.50	19.25	19.25	17.25	18.25
Golva	17	006	3191	48	20.25	20.00	20.00	19.75	19.25
Oriska	02	013	6641	49	22.50	21.25	20.25	18.25	17.75
Glenfield	16	014	3172	50	19.25	25.75	32.25	33.75	22.75
Hannaford	20	022	3444	50	21.75	19.75	21.00	35.75	21.75
Tuttle	22	020	8571	50	20.75	22.25	19.75	21.75	22.75
Butte	28	062	1225	50	25.50	23.25	24.50	24.25	19.75
Goodrich	42	016	3199	50	21.75	20.25	20.25	24.25	23.25
Taylor	45	003	8335	50	23.75	24.50	24.75	29.75	24.25
Chaffee	09	026	1370	51	16.75	17.50	22.75	19.25	19.75
Crary	36	003	1605	51	22.00	28.00	20.75	24.25	23.75
Clifford-Galesburg	49	004	1459	51	22.25	21.75	21.75	21.75	24.75
Wolford	35	001	9508	52	20.00	22.75	20.25	20.75	20.25

Table 1--Continued

District Name	Co. No.	Dist. No.	Plant No.	Enroll 76-77	Course Offerings 72-73	73-74	74-75	75-76	76-77
Fingal	02	054	2825	53	23.00	23.75	22.25	22.75	22.75
McHenry	16	015	5597	53	18.75	16.50	27.75	28.75	18.75
Golden Valley	29	020	4781	53	18.50	18.25	15.00	16.25	17.75
Bisbee	48	002	0964	53	22.75	22.75	23.75	22.75	25.25
Milton	10	030	5725	54	19.75	21.75	20.25	18.75	23.25
Hague	15	030	2280	54	13.25	17.25	16.25	18.25	16.75
Alexander	27	002	0315	54	23.25	20.25	22.75	21.75	22.75
Rhame	06	017	7421	55	21.00	21.50	24.00	23.25	21.75
Selfridge	43	008	7804	56	19.75	24.00	25.75	23.75	21.75
Bowdon	52	023	1039	56	19.75	20.00	22.25	21.00	43.75
Border Central (Calvin)	10	014	1028	59	26.75	26.25	21.75	25.75	24.25
Plaza	31	137	7108	59	23.75	26.25	25.25	23.25	21.75
Verona	23	011	9009	61	19.00	17.25	17.75	16.25	16.75
New Leipzig	19	015	6031	63	22.50	22.75	21.75	22.50	21.75
Binford	20	023	0958	63	20.75	23.25	25.75	38.75	23.75
Lehr	26	010	5200	63	19.75	22.75	26.25	33.75	24.75
Sheldon	37	002	7845	63	20.75	21.50	21.25	21.75	20.75
Warwick	03	029	9219	65	22.75	25.00	24.25	23.75	20.75
Aneta	32	020	0423	65	20.00	17.25	19.75	33.75	19.75
Reeder	01	003	7369	66	20.00	22.75	22.25	20.75	18.75
Karlsruhe	25	054	4830	66	22.75	22.25	22.75	23.75	23.75
Streeter	47	042	8250	66	24.50	22.75	21.75	21.75	22.75
Sykes (Sykeston)	52	039	8284	66	20.75	18.75	18.75	19.75	20.75
Willow City	05	013	9422	67	28.75	27.25	27.75	27.75	28.75

Table 1--Continued

District Name	Co. No.	Dist. No.	Plant No.	Enroll 76-77	Course Offerings 72-73	73-74	74-75	75-76	76-77
Sheyenne	14	012	7861	67	21.75	25.75	24.25	23.75	26.00
Starkweather	36	044	8230	67	27.75	24.75	23.75	23.75	25.75
Wimbledon	02	082	9463	69	23.75	23.25	28.25	27.25	21.75
Wing	08	028	9470	69	27.75	24.75	24.75	24.75	24.25
Munich	10	019	5895	69	21.25	22.50	23.25	24.25	23.75
Adams	50	128	0081	71	20.75	20.75	20.75	22.25	20.75
Columbus	07	034	1528	72	23.25	22.75	19.75	23.25	27.25
Cass Valley (Argusville)	09	076	0513	73	22.25	22.25	19.50	24.75	22.75
St. Thomas	34	043	8212	73	25.75	24.75	24.75	22.25	23.25
Montpelier	47	014	5794	73	24.75	27.00	27.75	28.75	28.25
Fordville	50	079	2891	73	22.25	21.75	22.75	25.75	27.75
Kensal	47	019	4892	74	25.75	23.75	22.50	23.75	24.75
Pembina	34	001	6982	75	23.75	23.75	24.25	25.75	25.25
Eight Mile (Trenton)	53	006	2270	75	23.00	21.75	23.25	24.50	26.25
Regent	21	014	7388	76	27.75	29.25	28.75	25.25	24.25
Upham	25	029	8839	76	25.00	22.25	24.75	27.25	19.75
Zeeland	26	004	9849	76	23.75	22.75	22.75	22.25	17.75
Tappen	22	028	8318	77	16.75	19.50	26.75	26.25	27.25
Sherwood	38	002	7858	77	21.25	22.75	12.75	22.75	22.75
Bowbells	07	014	1037	78	26.75	16.75	27.25	26.75	27.25
Minnewauken	03	005	5741	83	21.75	24.75	21.50	22.25	23.25
Marion	23	009	5483	83	23.75	22.75	22.75	22.75	26.25
Strasburg	15	015	8248	85	22.00	22.75	23.75	23.25	23.75
Granville	25	025	3253	86	22.75	21.50	20.25	23.25	25.25

Table 1—Continued

District Name	Co. No.	Dist. No.	Plant No.	Enroll 76-77	Course Offerings 72-73	73-74	74-75	75-76	76-77
Riverdale	28	089	7481	86	23.75	26.75	28.50	24.75	29.75
Tolna	32	074	8506	86	23.75	26.75	25.75	23.75	23.75
Unity (Petersburg)	32	080	8826	86	24.75	24.25	25.25	27.75	27.75
North Central (Rock Lake)	48	028	6122	86	24.25	24.25	25.75	27.25	25.75
McVille	32	046	5641	87	28.25	26.25	26.25	37.75	38.25
Neche	34	055	5999	88	29.75	28.00	27.25	26.75	24.75
Fairmount	39	018	2739	89	22.50	20.75	20.75	33.75	23.75
Stanton	29	022	8224	90	22.50	22.25	21.75	23.25	25.25
Drake	25	057	1925	91	30.75	31.25	30.25	30.25	29.75
Valley (Hoople)	34	012	3721	91	29.50	27.25	28.50	23.25	22.25
Carpio	51	156	1302	91	27.75	16.00	26.75	26.75	28.75
Burke Central (Lignite)	07	036	5262	92	23.25	22.25	26.75	26.25	25.75
Gackle	24	014	3013	92	26.75	28.25	27.75	29.25	30.25
Powers Lake	07	027	7158	93	30.50	30.00	24.25	27.75	27.75
Page	09	080	6882	93	28.25	28.75	29.75	29.75	23.25
Halliday	13	019	3390	93	26.75	29.25	29.00	28.75	24.75
Grenora	53	099	3281	96	28.00	23.75	30.75	36.75	31.75
Hazelton	15	006	3527	97	27.75	27.50	26.75	29.75	24.25
Anamoose	25	014	0389	97	26.75	27.75	24.75	28.75	24.50
Underwood	28	008	8806	97	26.75	25.75	25.50	26.00	26.75
Medina	47	003	5657	98	23.75	24.50	26.75	25.75	25.25
Edinburg	50	106	2109	98	27.25	27.75	26.75	28.75	29.75
Sawyer	51	016	7717	99	27.75	27.75	27.25	27.75	29.75

Table 1--Continued

District Name	Co. No.	Dist. No.	Plant No.	Enroll 76-77	Course Offerings 72-73	73-74	74-75	75-76	76-77
Berthold	51	054	0916	99	28.25	29.25	29.75	29.25	31.25
Kulm	23	007	5068	100	30.75	29.75	29.50	23.75	25.25
Hope	46	010	3729	100	26.25	26.75	25.75	27.75	23.75
North Shore (Makoti)	51	158	5446	100	22.25	20.75	22.25	25.75	24.75
Hatton	49	007	3504	101	26.00	27.75	27.25	27.25	28.25
Solen	43	003	8036	102	34.50	31.00	33.75	27.25	29.25
Roosevelt (Carson)	19	018	1306	103	29.75	29.25	30.25	30.25	29.25
St. John	40	003	8152	103	26.00	25.75	24.25	29.75	25.75
North Sargent (Gwinner)	41	003	6130	104	25.25	25.25	25.75	39.25	23.25
Scranton	06	033	7785	107	31.25	30.00	29.50	26.75	29.75
Maddock	03	009	0902	109	38.75	35.75	35.75	39.75	40.75
Milnor	41	002	5719	109	25.75	29.25	27.75	29.75	30.25
Max	28	050	5519	111	29.25	31.00	23.75	26.75	26.25
Litchville	02	052	5298	112	25.75	25.00	24.75	24.75	24.25
Minto	50	020	5759	113	23.75	29.75	33.75	39.75	30.75
Washburn	28	004	9239	114	29.75	29.75	29.25	31.75	31.75
Ray	53	002	7352	117	25.75	28.25	27.75	29.25	27.75
Esmond	03	025	2510	118	23.00	25.75	25.75	26.75	30.25
Glenburn	38	026	3169	119	26.75	28.25	27.75	27.75	31.25
Westhope	05	017	9325	120	26.75	27.75	28.00	26.75	26.75
Michigan	32	040	5699	121	22.75	23.75	25.75	24.00	24.25
Drayton	34	019	1928	121	34.00	35.00	40.00	41.00	41.00
Thompson	18	061	8416	122	22.75	25.75	25.25	25.75	29.25
Rolette	40	029	7555	122	26.75	25.75	28.25	28.75	26.00

Table 1--Continued

District Name	Co. No.	Dist. No.	Plant No.	Enroll 76-77	Course Offerings 72-73	73-74	74-75	75-76	76-77
Leeds	03	006	5184	123	26.75	28.75	35.75	32.75	34.25
Elgin	19	016	2328	125	28.75	30.00	30.00	29.75	30.25
Surrey	51	041	8266	126	17.25	24.50	37.25	46.25	35.75
New England	21	009	6026	130	29.75	29.25	29.25	29.75	32.75
Hebron	30	013	3537	131	35.00	35.25	37.50	32.75	33.75
Finley	46	003	2827	131	26.75	28.75	22.75	44.75	31.75
Wilton	28	001	9451	132	25.75	24.75	27.75	25.75	27.25
Maple Valley(Buffalo)	09	004	1148	134	25.75	30.25	25.25	32.25	28.75
Richland (Colfax)	39	044	6120	134	28.25	27.75	26.25	27.75	27.75
North Central (Rogers)	02	065	6118	135	23.75	25.25	22.75	28.75	26.75
Edmore	36	002	2113	136	27.75	27.75	29.75	28.75	31.25
Northwood	18	129	6134	139	30.50	32.75	31.75	35.75	33.75
Mohall	38	009	5778	139	36.00	39.25	37.50	36.25	38.00
Central Valley (Buxton)	49	003	1369	139	35.25	35.25	35.25	32.25	32.25
Fessenden	52	040	2792	139	31.75	32.25	31.75	31.75	34.75
Steele	22	026	8232	142	27.25	27.75	28.75	27.75	27.25
Parshall	31	003	6925	142	33.25	35.25	34.25	34.25	32.75
Dakota-Hunter (Arthur)	09	003	0525	143	27.25	33.00	30.00	34.75	37.25
South Heart	45	009	8060	147	27.25	29.25	29.25	33.25	33.25
Flasher	30	039	2854	150	27.75	33.00	35.75	31.75	25.25
Turtle Lake	28	072	8562	152	29.25	30.75	31.75	32.25	29.25
Ashley	26	009	0539	157	34.75	38.00	37.00	36.25	37.25
Richardton	45	004	7433	159	26.75	32.25	33.75	29.25	28.75

Table 1--Continued

District Name	Co. No.	Dist. No.	Plant No.	Enroll 76-77	Course Offerings 72-73	73-74	74-75	75-76	76-77
Cooperston	20	018	1555	162	34.25	42.50	44.25	45.25	40.75
Des Lacs Burlington	51	007	8823	162	27.75	29.75	32.75	31.75	31.75
Midway (Inkster)	18	128	5707	165	37.25	39.75	41.25	30.75	32.75
Ellendale	11	040	2330	169	31.75	32.50	37.25	37.75	36.75
Center	33	018	1350	172	30.25	30.75	33.25	33.75	30.75
McClusky	42	019	5532	173	31.00	20.00	35.25	38.25	38.50
Killdeer	13	016	4927	175	36.75	36.00	39.00	41.25	38.25
Beulah	29	027	0924	177	30.50	31.25	31.25	33.25	35.75
Cando	48	008	1277	178	33.25	37.25	38.00	38.25	41.75
Rolla	40	004	7558	179	43.00	40.25	35.25	39.75	34.25
LaMoure	23	008	5145	180	53.50	57.25	50.25	45.75	46.25
Hankinson	39	008	3432	180	32.00	38.75	37.75	38.50	32.50
Newport (Towner)	25	004	6046	182	36.50	40.00	34.75	34.75	38.75
Glen Ullin	30	048	3165	188	33.25	33.75	32.75	34.00	41.75
Lakota	32	066	5136	190	33.25	32.00	34.25	39.25	40.75
Enderlin	37	022	2387	191	37.25	38.75	42.75	38.75	35.00
Lidgerwood	39	028	5260	192	29.50	29.25	33.50	36.25	36.50
Dunseith	40	001	1966	192	31.50	33.00	35.50	30.75	28.75
Beach	17	003	0850	196	44.50	44.50	44.50	43.75	43.75
Wyndmere	39	042	9627	196	33.00	40.75	45.00	44.75	45.75
Hazen	29	033	3529	203	31.25	30.00	32.50	33.25	36.75
Belfield	45	013	0884	205	37.25	32.50	34.75	45.25	34.75
Edgeley	23	003	2107	206	32.00	34.75	36.00	35.50	35.25
Sargent Central (Forman)	41	006	7709	206	39.00	37.75	37.75	52.75	57.75

Table 1--Continued

District Name	Co. No.	Dist. No.	Plant No.	Enroll 76-77	Course Offerings 72-73	73-74	74-75	75-76	76-77
Hillsboro	49	009	3630	210	35.50	36.50	36.25	42.25	42.75
Kindred	09	002	4933	213	35.25	36.50	36.00	36.25	37.25
Velva	25	001	9003	213	35.50	33.00	39.50	49.25	47.00
Park River	50	078	9208	217	28.75	33.50	35.25	37.75	36.25
Wishek	26	019	9477	219	34.75	36.25	35.75	39.25	38.25
Tioga	53	015	8463	222	32.50	33.50	29.25	32.25	30.75
Walhalla	34	027	9186	224	32.00	32.25	42.50	41.75	49.50
New Town	31	001	6039	229	40.50	44.75	39.75	43.25	41.25
Kenmare	51	028	4882	231	47.25	48.50	49.25	47.74	53.50
New Salem	30	007	6033	232	35.75	33.00	39.75	39.00	42.00
Central Cass (Casselton)	09	017	1354	238	39.00	44.00	44.75	41.25	43.25
Mott	21	006	5858	240	40.25	41.00	42.00	41.75	39.25
Garrison	28	051	3052	240	35.25	33.50	33.50	38.00	37.75
Stanley	31	002	8218	240	37.50	38.00	43.50	45.25	40.00
Hettinger	01	013	3599	247	50.25	54.50	54.50	50.25	37.25
Napoleon	24	002	5977	263	30.75	31.75	30.25	39.25	40.75
Bowman	06	001	1043	265	41.25	41.00	39.50	42.25	43.75
New Rockford	14	001	5971	267	41.00	45.50	51.50	54.25	53.25
McKenzie County (Watford City)	27	001	5606	272	45.00	45.50	44.25	45.75	46.25
Crosby	12	001	1866	275	38.75	37.00	34.25	35.75	37.25
(Noonan)	12	001	1870						
Cavalier	34	006	1323	283	33.75	36.50	37.50	41.00	41.50
Linton	15	036	5288	287	31.00	36.00	37.25	36.75	38.25
Oakes	11	041	6215	291	39.25	43.50	44.25	34.25	34.25

Table 1--Continued

District Name	Co. No.	Dist. No.	Plant No.	Enroll 76-77	Course Offerings 72-73	73-74	74-75	75-76	76-77
Mayville-Portland (Mayville)	49	010	5526	292	41.00	40.25	44.00	52.25	52.50
Lisbon	37	019	5296	306	38.25	45.75	44.50	41.25	49.25
Larimore	18	044	5169	312	40.50	40.25	39.75	39.25	42.25
Harvey	52	038	3479	337	38.25	43.75	45.50	45.75	41.75
Carrington	15	010	1304	339	33.25	36.00	50.75	53.25	54.75
Bottineau	05	001	1033	353	46.25	47.25	46.50	44.75	45.75
Rugby	35	005	7614	464	42.00	51.50	48.25	48.00	53.75
Wahpeton	39	037	9170	474	43.00	61.00	68.50	68.00	82.50
Langdon	10	023	5153	478	49.25	59.75	66.00	49.25	68.25
Grafton	50	003	3235	529	50.00	47.75	50.00	59.25	64.50
Valley City	02	002	8954	642	51.50	53.50	56.75	57.75	44.25
Devils Lake	36	001	1829	722	55.25	49.00	58.25	85.00	92.00
West Fargo	09	006	9315	885	71.50	66.00	77.75	78.75	84.00
Dickinson	45	001	1845	956	87.75	81.50	69.00	86.00	104.50
Williston	53	001	9416	1079	62.25	61.50	60.50	58.75	58.00
Central (Grand Forks)	18	001	3239	1127	73.00	116.00	84.00	76.25	63.25
Red River (Grand Forks)	18	001	7360	1218	78.50	84.00	76.00	78.75	76.75
Jamestown	47	001	4570	1265	60.25	67.25	63.50	70.25	70.50
Mandan	30	001	5453	1326	52.25	57.25	60.25	77.25	85.50
*Magic City Campus (Minot)	51	001	5752	1357			224.50	167.00	187.00
Central Campus (Minot)	51	001	5750	1496	77.00*	167.50*			

*Minot had only one high school for three of these five years.

Table 1--Continued

District Name	Co. No.	Dist. No.	Plant No.	Enroll 76-77	Course Offerings 72-73	73-74	74-75	75-76	76-77
Bismarck	08	001	0970	1522	110.50	153.25	150.50	123.50	122.25
Century (Bismarck)	08	001	1365	726	A new school.			88.50	92.50
South (Fargo)	09	001	2744	1677	87.00	247.50		101.50	107.00
North (Fargo)	09	001	6125	1196			200.00	71.75	72.00

REORGANIZATION AND ANNEXATION

Following the settlement of the state, school buildings appeared on the landscape. They were authorized by newly established school districts to fulfill the educational needs of the children who often walked to the buildings from the nearby farms and villages. The districts were "small" in terms of area.

This picture was changed, however, by the Depression and the "dirty thirties". The abandonment of the farms and villages by the settlers resulted in the abandonment of many schools, a trend discernible to this day. Better highways and more efficient means of transportation reinforced the trend. So, too, did ideas about optimal or efficient sizes of schools.

Such terms as annexation, dissolution, and reorganization took on an educational significance. Laws to facilitate these practices in changing boundaries or existences of school districts were passed by the legislature.

The decline in the number of school districts continued at a rapid rate into the mid-sixties. The statistics from that point reflect a more restrained pace. There has been a great deal of speculation relative to the reason for the slowdown in the number of reorganizations, annexations, and dissolutions--the options available to a district for changing its district organization.

It has been suggested, for instance, that the decrease in the number of organizational changes might be attributed to the provision in the state foundation aid program which assigns a greater level of state financial support to the smaller schools. It is contended that this additional support enables small school districts to continue to operate in spite of limited local resources, a factor which may have been instrumental previously in their demise.

The study group acquired data to attempt to determine whether the present foundation program has encouraged the continued operation of a large number of small schools.

The study took several directions. An analysis was made of the minutes of the State Board of Public School Education meetings for the period of time extending from July 1, 1967 through June 31, 1977. The data were reviewed for the ten-year period to allow for a more extended longitudinal analysis.

The minutes reported the action taken by the Board on petitions for annexation, dissolution, and reorganization which had been submitted by the county reorganization committees. Because the approval of a reorganization plan by the Board can be overridden by a vote of the electorate in the participating school districts, a report which listed all of the reorganization plans approved locally was also utilized. The number of reorganizations occurring during those years is reported in Table 1.

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF REORGANIZATIONS OF NORTH DAKOTA SCHOOL DISTRICTS

1967-68 to 1976-77

67-68	68-69	69-70	70-71	71-72	72-73	73-74	74-75	75-76	76-77
2	4	2	1	1	0	0	0	2	1

Reorganization is only one method by which school district boundaries can be changed; dissolution of districts and annexation to other districts also reorganizes in a general sense. The following table reports change in organization involving more than ten sections of land, by school year.

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF ANNEXATIONS, DISSOLUTIONS, OR REORGANIZATIONS APPROVED BY THE STATE BOARD OF PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION (INVOLVING MORE THAN TEN SECTIONS OF LAND)

67-68	68-69	69-70	70-71	71-72	72-73	73-74	74-75	75-76	76-77
27	23	31	28	19	9	8	12	11	5

The data in Table 2 reflect a substantial decrease in the number of changes in school district boundaries toward the end of the ten-year period. It is on this basis that speculation implying a causal relationship between the present foundation program and a decrease in reorganizations, annexations, and dissolutions since it went into effect in 1973 has persisted.

The study group suggests that other factors should be considered in the final determination of causation. The data in the table on the next page would suggest additional considerations. The data were obtained from the Educational Directory, which is published annually by the Department of Public Instruction.

Several implications can be drawn from this information. Considering the geographic size of the state and the number of districts remaining following the mid-sixties, it would appear logical that any form of reorganization would have to continue at a more modest pace. As the number of districts and facilities continue to decrease, the distance traveled by the students to attend school will continue to increase. This results in increased travel time to the student and increased costs for transportation to the districts. These effects may have discouraged the continuation of any form of reorganization in some parts of the state.

Table 3 reports substantial increase in the number of professional personnel in spite of a decrease in student enrollment during the same ten-year period. It can be assumed that a substantial number of the total increase in personnel can be attributed to the expansion of services and programming in the districts. This is especially true in the area of special education and vocational education programs. It is possible that these additional services and programs have discouraged the various forms of reorganization because they fulfill the needs of districts--a fulfillment available previously only through combining with a larger district.

Another factor which must be considered is the increase in the number of available professional staff. The limited number of teachers available prior to the early

TABLE 3

SUMMARY DATA OF ENROLLMENTS, TYPES AND NUMBERS OF

SCHOOL DISTRICTS, AND PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL

(1967-68 through 1976-77)

School Term	67/68	68/69	69/70	70/71	71/72	72/73	73/74	74/75	75/76	76/77
Enrollment in Public, BIA, Non-Public, and State Inst. Schools	167,746	167,012	164,191	163,074	160,206	157,016	153,977	149,013	146,636	143,965
Public School Districts Operating	438	416	375	356	343	338	329	325	320	312
Non-Operating School Districts	60	58	60	55	42	34	35	35	31	32
Professional Personnel: Public, BIA, Non-Public, and State Institutions	9,246	9,265	9,097	9,166	9,263	9,358	9,582	9,668	9,715	10,490

87

seventies made it extremely difficult for the small schools to obtain qualified and competent staff. This problem forced some districts to combine to assure quality programming. Although this problem has not been totally alleviated, it has been relieved.

Thus, taking into consideration a number of factors which may contribute to the pace of school district reorganization, annexation, and dissolution, it is the consensus of the study group that the present foundation program is not the only, and may not even be a major, contributor to organizational activities. At least, considering the several factors detailed here, the study group is not persuaded that a powerful argument for abandonment of indices exists for the reason that organizational efficiency would be enhanced.

Having said that, the study group recognized several "disincentives" to consideration of annexation or reorganization. Examples might include loss of levy authority and step-downs in indices. In the former instance, district officers who "enjoy" some excess levy authority granted by the electorate in the past might be reluctant to reorganize with another district and, in the process, lose that excess levy authority. This would be particularly true if there were uncertainty about the likelihood of being granted an excess levy authority in the newly organized district. Similarly, school district officers might be reluctant to urge reorganization if the two districts contemplating the reorganization "lost money" by reorganizing. For instance, suppose one district received 1.32 weighted pupil units for every high school student in average daily membership and the other district received 1.70 weighted pupil units for every high school student in average daily membership. After the "marriage" all would have an index of 1.32. It could be argued that 0.38 units (1.70-1.32) were lost for every student in the second district.

Such "disincentives" warrant identification and attention.

ISSUES IN FINANCING SPECIAL EDUCATION

Special education services for North Dakota public school students are increasing. North Dakota statute states:

> School districts shall provide special education to handicapped children in accordance with the provisions of this chapter and in so doing may act jointly with one or more other districts and shall cooperate with the State Advisory Council and the Director of Special Education and with the institutions of the state. Each school district shall submit a plan with the Superintendent of Public Instruction for implementing special education in the district by July 1, 1975. Special education services shall be fully implemented by July 1, 1980. School districts may provide special education to gifted children in accordance with the provisions of this chapter and in so doing may act jointly with one or more other districts and shall cooperate with the State Advisory Council and the Director of Special Education. (Source: NDCC [15-59-94])

This statute indicates that special education will most likely be in a growth pattern until at least July 1, 1980. The funding for this aspect of public education will receive increasing attention as the amount of service increases.

Section 15-59-06 of the North Dakota law places the limits of per capita expenditure for special education at one and one-half times the state average per-pupil cost for instruction and two times the state average per-pupil cost for transportation, equipment, and residential care.

Section 15-59-05 provides that the Advisory Council, which is the State Board of Public School Education, and the Director of Special Education, who is employed by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, ". . . shall prescribe rules and regulations for the special education of exceptional children . . . "

A school may budget money from the general fund to finance special education and it may levy up to three mills upon approval of the voters if the county does not have the special education levy.

The County Board of Special Education is appointed by the County Superintendent of Schools. The Board of County Commissioners approves the program and budget for special education and may budget funds from the county general fund. A three mill special

education levy may be used if approved by the voters. Counties may form multi-county cooperative special education programs.

Department of Public Instruction Special Education Regulations and Guidelines (1976)

The first regulation states, "All programs shall have prior approval from the Department of Public Instruction, Special Education Director, and meet regulatory standards to receive special education reimbursement."

Regulation Three requires that, "The minimum total school enrollment (grades 1-12) for implementing a special education plan is 1,500 students."

Regulation Four states: "Section 15-59-06 required that school districts make expenditures for each handicapped student at least equal to the average made in the district elementary or secondary program before qualifying for additional reimbursement from state special education funds."

The levels of state reimbursement for the 1976-77 school year as indicated by the application forms are as follows:

1.	Program Coordinator	$ 9,000
2.	Itinerant Teachers	7,000
	A. Speech Clinicians	
	B. Visiting Counselors	
	C. Learning Disabilities	
	D. Partially Sighted	
	E. Hard of Hearing	
3.	Resource Room Teachers	4,500
	A. Visually Impaired	
	B. Hearing Impaired	
	C. Educable Mentally Retarded	
	D. Emotionally Disturbed	
	E. Specific Learning Disabilities	
4.	Special Class Teacher	4,500
	A. Educable Mentally Handicapped	
	B. Trainable Mentally Handicapped	
	C. Physically Handicapped	

5.	Special Class Teachers	$ 6,000
	A. Preschool Handicapped	
	B. Visually Impaired	
	C. Hearing Impaired	
	D. Severely Multiple Handicapped	
6.	Individual Instruction (homebound, hospital supplementary) per hour - five hours per week	3,000
7.	Director of Special Education	13,000
8.	Aides	2,000
9.	Equipment - New Classrooms	
	A. Trainable Handicapped	
	B. Visually Impaired	
	C. Hearing Impaired	
	D. Severely Multiple Handicapped	
10.	Transportation/Lodging (Children)	Foster home: Lesser of $75/month or--Transportation at 12¢/mile
11.	Transportation of Staff	$50/year within a school district $250/year within a county or multi-county program
12.	Tutors in Training	4,000

The special education reimbursement by the State of North Dakota for special education services totalled $2,251,593.43 in 1976-77.*

Special Education Financing Plans

It is extremely difficult to separate programming, cost determination, and level of funding from the method of funding. The method of funding special education may influence the type of programs offered, the cost of the programs, and the level of funding.

The purpose of this section is to discuss funding formulae. It is important to remember, however, that the funding formula may have an effect on the type of programs

*Editor's note: This paper was written during the summer of 1978. Legislation during the 1979 Session modified some of the provisions reported to this point. That circumstance, however, does not, in the view of the study group, minimize the value of the discussion which follows.

offered, the cost of the programs, and the level of funding. The six methods of funding special education as identified by Bernstein, Hartman,and Marshall (1976) are:

1. Unit
2. Weight
3. Percentage
4. Personnel
5. Straight Sum
6. Excess Cost

William McLure (1975) identified four methods of funding instructionsl costs using different criteria for grouping:

1. Full state funding of all costs;
2. Full state funding for extra-instructional costs of special education;
3. Full cost allowance of special education programs in the general state aid formula;
4. Continuation of categorical cost component allowances.

Bernstein, Kirst, Hartman, and Marshall (1974) approached the question of categorical versus noncategorical funding in the following way:

> Several definitions of categorical and noncategorical funding are currently in use. For the purpose of highlighting the potential impact of the funding approach on handicapped children, the following definitions are used: A categorical funding approach identifies specific funds for handicapped children--the funds are earmarked and can only be used for programs for the handicapped. A noncategorical funding approach does not identify specific funds for the handicapped--such funds either are included in general education funding or lose their identity in the funding process.
>
> Under a categorical funding approach, it is important to distinguish between systems that require categorical classification of individual children and those that do not. For example, if the state special education reimbursement is based on a specified amount for a handicapped child, then a student must be certified (e.g., categorized as being mentally retarded) before the district is eligible to receive special education funding for that child. This type of categorical funding approach requires the labeling of children by handicapping condition as an integral part of the funding mechanism. On the other hand, a categorical system that provides funds specifically for special education and allows those funds to be used for any child requiring special education services, does not require the categorization of individual children.
>
> Thus, the categorical approach may provide a financial incentive to label children in order to qualify for funds. If state reimbursements are different for different types of handicapping conditions, there is a danger that children will be misclassified into a higher funded category. A categorical approach also tends to lock a child into special education, because declassifying a child as eligible for special education would mean a loss of funds for the district. This problem may be alleviated by providing adequate funding for a range of instructional and support services that would allow a child to function in a regular classroom setting with intermittent support services.

With a noncategorical funding approach, however, the funds intended to finance educational programs for handicapped students are provided to the agency operating the programs without specific requirements that they be used only for special education. Once the funds reach the operating agency, they are included in the agency's general school revenues and are not identified as special education funds. The operating agency has discretion on how the funds are to be used and in which programs; thus the funds for special education are allocated by the operating agency, not the funding agency. If the operating agency has different priorities than the funding agency, the operating agency may legitimately (but unfortunately for special education) reallocate funds intended for special education to other educational programs. Furthermore, under a noncategorical approach there is no way to match accurately the revenues and expenditures for special education.

The unit method of finance reimburses each district based on the number of classroom units in special education. The unit basis includes an amount calculated to include teacher and material costs. Ohio is an example of a state using the unit basis of special education financing.

The weighted system uses the foundation aid per pupil unit basis for financing special education. A predetermined weight is assigned to each category of special education. Florida is an example of a state using the weighted pupil unit method.

The percentage method reimburses the schools a fixed percentage of the cost of providing services in special education. Wisconsin is a state using the percentage type of financing plan.

A personnel financing formula reimburses the school districts based on a set amount for each person employed in special education. This is the method employed in North Dakota.

Straight sum funding provides a set amount for each student with various types of handicaps. The amount set is not determined by foundation aid figures. Arizona uses the straight sum formula.

The excess cost method requires that the amount of money used to educate the average student be subtracted from the cost of educating the special education student. The state then reimburses the total difference or a percentage of the difference. Pennsylvania utilizes this plan.

The concepts described by William McLure generally approach the methods from a different view. McLure approaches the question with a view concerning basic philosophies of funding with less concern for the actual method upon which the funding is based.

The first method is full state funding of all costs. The full state funding could be for all students or just special education students.

The second method is full state funding of extra-instructional costs of special education programs. This method is really the same as the excess cost formula.

The third method is the full cost allowance of special education programs in the general state aid formula. This could require more than just a per pupil weighting because of the differences in local wealth of the school district.

Continuation of categorical cost component allowances is the fourth method. This method may be replaced as better data concerning special education are made available.

Summary

It appears that concerns regarding the methods of special education funding can be addressed only from a framework in which the philosophies of special education and general education are expressed.

If it is agreed that no district should have an unusual burden because of a higher than normal incidence of special education expenses, then full state funding of special education would be indicated.

If it is agreed that no district should be provided state funds without an incentive to control costs, then the districts may be required to provide part of the costs of special education.

If local districts should have control over the expenditure of funds, then a weighted pupil unit for special education might be the best method. If the state should be the agency with the primary responsibility for determining that the needs of special

education students are being met, then a different formula may accomplish that purpose to a higher degree.

The categorical or noncategorical question appears to be answerable only if basic philosophies concerning primary responsibility in special education are determined.

If the main concern is that monies be provided to special education separate from general incomes so that programs can be established, maintained, or improved, then categorical aids may be necessary which may require extra staff and expenditure of funds.

If the main concern is that local schools maintain control, or that increases in state department of education staff be minimized, then the noncategorical aid might be indicated.

It is obvious to the study group that the funding mechanism should be based on a general philosophy of the special education program.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bernstein, Charles D.; Hartman, William T.; and Marshall, Rudolph S. "Major Policy Issues in Financing Special Education," Journal of Education Finance, 1 (Winter, 1976): 299-317.

Bernstein, Charles D.; Kirst, Michael W.; Hartman, William T.; and Marshall, Rudolph S. Financing Educational Services for the Handicapped: An Analysis of Current Research and Practices, Palo Alto, California: Management Analysis Center, Inc., 1974.

McLure, William P. "Alternative Methods of Financing Special Education," Journal of Education Finance, 1 (Summer, 1975): 36-51.

Special Education in North Dakota, Guide I - Laws, Regulations and Guidelines for Special Education for Exceptional Students, Bismarck, North Dakota: Department of Public Instruction (August, 1976).

SPECIAL EDUCATION INCIDENCES

The data for this analysis were obtained from the Office of the Director of Special Education, Department of Public Instruction.

The following table indicates the percentage of the entire school population which had been served on a May 1, 1977 count. This count included all of the handicaps, and if a student had two handicaps, he was counted twice which is referred to as a "duplicate count".

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOL POPULATION PROVIDED WITH SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICE(S)

Belcourt	15.7	Richland-Sargeant-Ransom	6.6
Wishek	15.3	Ward	6.4
Fargo	14.3	Sherwin-Wells-Benson-G.F.	6.3
Billings County	13.8	Burke	6.3
Stutsman	12.5	Bottineau-Rollette-Renville	6.0
Grand Forks	11.8	Kidder-Emmons-Logan	5.9
Mountrail	11.4	Mott	5.9
Barnes	11.3	Regent	5.7
Burleigh	10.4	Mandan	5.4
Dickey	10.1	McLean	5.3
West Fargo	9.8	Cass County	5.0
Ashley	9.0	New England	4.5
LaMoure	8.4	Pierce-McHenry	4.0
Lake Region	8.2	Oliver-Mercer	3.8
Trail-Griggs	8.0	Divide	3.3
McKenzie-Williams	7.5	Dunn	3.3
Pembina	7.5	New Salem	2.6
Golden Valley	7.3	Flasher	1.8
Stark	6.9	Sioux	1.3
Walsh-Grand Forks	6.7		

The above 39 reporting units ranged from a low of 1.3 percent to a high of 15.7 percent. Some of the reporting units represented multi-county units, some represented counties, and some represented school districts. It is apparent that the unit reporting the highest percentage served reported a percentage 12 times as large as the unit

reporting the smallest percentage served. This may well be a case of what progress has been made in performing searches for the handicapped, rather than a true indication of the number of handicaps that exist in each of the units.

The entire area of special education may better be studied after a few more years have passed. The federal legislation (P.L. 94-142) is still sufficiently recent that not all units have been operating long enough to locate and serve all special students. At that time it may be easier to identify unusual burdens, if they exist.

Table 2 details "anticipated frequencies" of handicapping conditions of children in the U.S. The tables following Table 2 report data by handicapping condition. There are prob..ems with the data of children in North Dakota--and several more problems can be deduced or inferred. Not all data are available, not all data are complete for all reporting units, data formats are unfamiliar or classification schemes are employed differently, and initial reporting efforts are likely to be flawed.

Decision or conclusion based on flawed data seems unwarranted.

The data will improve given greater time. The study team is persuaded that activities underway will have this eventual effect.

One reason for addressing the question of incidences was to learn whether unusual, atypical burdens ("overburden") might exist for some districts. The present data do not permit drawing a conclusion about that question. But the question is a good one. The study team believes the data should be collected and displayed annually. Especially in districts where there is perception of possible unusual burden, those data should be monitored. If an unusual burden exists, say because parents choose to move to and work in a community which provides a special service, there is at least a policy question regarding who--what district, what governmental unit--should be financially responsible for the unusual burden.

TABLE 2

INCIDENCE OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN, FISCAL YEAR 1976

Type of Handicap	Number of Children	Percent of all Children in U.S.
Speech Impaired	2,293,000	3.500
Mentally Retarded	1,507,000	2.300
Learning Disabled	1,966,000	3.000
Emotionally Disturbed	1,310,000	2.000
Crippled and other Health Impaired	328,000	.500
Deaf	49,000	.075
Hard of Hearing	328,000	.500
Visually Impaired	66,000	.100
Deaf-Blind and other Multiply Handicapped	40,000	.060
TOTAL	7,870,000	12.035

SOURCE: Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, 1977

TABLE 3

SPEECH IMPAIRED

UNIT OR DISTRICT REPORTED

Unit	Enrollment 1 - 12	Students Served	Reported Expected Incidence	National Expected Incidence 3.5%
Cass/Fargo	2,417	217	451	85
Barnes	3,050	172	225	107
Benson/Eddy/Foster/Wells/Sheridan	5,613	269	224	196
Bottineau/Rolette/Renville	4,567	172	180	160
Belcourt	1,601	150	150	56
Bismarck	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Burleigh	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Divide/Mountrail/Burke	3,262	150	130	114
Dickey	1,511	57	75	53
Grand Forks Rural/Walsh	5,222	133	208	183
Grand Forks (City)	9,400	323	376	329
Kidder/McIntosh/Logan	382	22	15	13
Emmons	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Pembina	2,700	87	108	95
LaMoure	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Lake Region	7,944	255	318	278
McHenry/Pierce	3,576	130	179	125
Morton	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mandan	n/a	91	135	n/a
New Salem	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Adams/Bowman/Slope	n/a	122	184	n/a
Hebron	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
McLean	2,894	132	56	101
Mercer/Oliver	2,000	66	80	70
Richland/Ransom/Sargent	6,570	n/a	n/a	230
Stark/Dunn/Golden Valley/Billings	8,590	230	344	301
Stutsman	4,725	152	188	165
Sioux	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Traill/Grant/Steele	n/a	121	n/a	n/a
Williams	4,478	151	179	157
West Fargo	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Ward	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Ft. Totten	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Wahpeton	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
United Tribes	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

TABLE 4

MENTALLY RETARDED

UNIT OR DISTRICT REPORTED

Unit	Enrollment 1 - 12	Students Served	Reported Expected Incidence	National Expected Incidence 2.3%
Cass/Fargo	2,417	153	196	56
Barnes	3,050	31	35	70
Benson/Eddy/Foster/Wells/Sheridan	5,613	93	98	129
Bottineau/Rolette/Renville	4,567	40	79	105
Belcourt	1,601	73	73	37
Bismarck	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Burleigh	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Divide/Mountrail/Burke	3,262	28	56	75
Dickey	1,511	13	33	35
Grand Forks Rural/Walsh	5,222	69	78	120
Grand Forks (City)	9,400	179	190	216
Kidder/McIntosh/Logan	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Emmons	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Pembina	2,700	28	48	62
LaMoure	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Lake Region	7,944	114	139	183
McHenry/Pierce	3,576	33	79	82
Morton	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mandan	n/a	60	60	n/a
New Salem	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Adams/Bowman/Slope	n/a	55	77	n/a
Hebron	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
McLean	2,894	15	4	67
Mercer/Oliver	2,000	19	35	46
Richland/Ransom/Sargent	6,570	61	144	151
Stark/Dunn/Golden Valley/Billings	8,590	133	150	198
Stutsman	4,725	115	117	109
Sioux	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Traill/Grant/Steele	n/a	26	n/a	n/a
Williams	4,478	69	78	103
West Fargo	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Ward	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Ft. Totten	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Wahpeton	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
United Tribes	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

TABLE 5

LEARNING DISABLED

UNIT OR DISTRICT REPORTED

Unit	Enrollment 1 - 12	Students Served	Reported Expected Incidence	National Expected Incidence 3.0%
Cass/Fargo	2,417	268	395	73
Barnes	3,050	161	181	92
Benson/Eddy/Foster/Wells/Sheridan	5,613	82	112	168
Bottineau/Rolette/Renville	4,567	42	90	137
Belcourt	1,601	58	64	48
Bismarck	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Burleigh	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Divide/Mountrail/Burke	3,262	45	66	98
Dickey	1,511	40	0	45
Grand Forks Rural/Walsh	5,222	149	104	157
Grand Forks (city)	9,400	180	210	282
Kidder/McIntosh/Logan	382	0	8	11
Emmons	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Pembina	2,700	76	150	81
LaMoure	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Lake Region	7,944	165	159	238
McHenry/Pierce	3,576	73	73	107
Morton	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mandan	3,121	39	93	94
New Salem	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Adams/Bowman/Slope	4,078	30	92	122
Hebron	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
McLean	2,894	16	34	87
Mercer/Oliver	2,000	45	40	60
Richland/Ransom/Sargent	6,570	131	131	197
Stark/Dunn/Golden Valley/Billings	8,590	122	172	258
Stutsman	4,725	154	164	142
Sioux	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Traill/Grant/Steele	3,422	110	98	103
Williams	4,478	83	89	134
West Fargo	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Ward	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Ft. Totten	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Wahpeton	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
United Tribes	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

TABLE 6

EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED

UNIT OR DISTRICT REPORTED

Unit	Enrollment 1 - 12	Students Served	Reported Expected Incidence	National Expected Incidence 2.0%
Cass/Fargo	2,417	14	226	48
Barnes	3,050	4	15	61
Benson/Eddy/Foster/Wells/Sheridan	5,613	0	112	112
Bottineau/Rolette/Renville	4,567	0	90	91
Belcourt	1,601	0	14	32
Bismarck	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Burleigh	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Divide/Mountrail/Burke	3,262	0	66	65
Dickey	1,511	0	n/a	30
Grand Forks Rural/Walsh	5,222	7	104	104
Grand Forks (City)	9,400	8	20	188
Kidder/McIntosh/Logan	382	0	8	8
Emmons	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Pembina	2,700	8	54	54
LaMoure	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Lake Region	7,944	9	159	159
McHenry/Pierce	3,576	2	0	12
Morton	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mandan	n/a	3	93	n/a
New Salem	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Adams/Bowman/Slope	n/a	1	92	n/a
Hebron	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
McLean	2,894	0	n/a	58
Mercer/Oliver	2,000	0	40	40
Richland/Ransom/Sargent	6,570	0	0	131
Stark/Dunn/Golden Valley/ Billings	8,590	22	172	172
Stutsman	4,725	3	94	95
Sioux	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Traill/Grant/Steele	n/a	2	n/a	n/a
Williams	4,478	0	89	90
West Fargo	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Ward	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Ft. Totten	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Wahpeton	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
United Tribes	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

TABLE 7

ORTHOPEDICALLY AND OTHER HEALTH IMPAIRED

UNIT OR DISTRICT REPORTED

Unit	Enrollment 1 - 12	Students Served	Reported Expected Incidence	National Expected Incidence 0.5%
Cass/Fargo	2,417	20	23	12
Barnes	3,050	0	0	15
Benson/Eddy/Foster/Wells/Sheridan	5,613	0	4	28
Bottineau/Rolette/Renville	4,567	2	9	23
Belcourt	1,601	6	6	8
Bismarck	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Burleigh	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Divide/Mountrail/Burke	3,262	n/a	n/a	16
Dickey	1,511	2	n/a	8
Grand Forks Rural/Walsh	5,222	2	0	26
Grand Forks (City)	9,400	6	8	47
Kidder/McIntosh/Logan	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Emmons	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Pembina	2,700	0	2	14
LaMoure	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Lake Region	7,944	5	2	40
McHenry/Pierce	3,576	n/a	n/a	18
Morton	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mandan	n/a	4	15	n/a
New Salem	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Adams/Bowman/Slope	n/a	0	28	n/a
Hebron	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
McLean	2,894	1	2	14
Mercer/Oliver	2,000	n/a	8	10
Richland/Ransom/Sargent	6,570	n/a	n/a	33
Stark/Dunn/Golden Valley/Billings	8,590	4	17	43
Stutsman	4,725	8	0	24
Sioux	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Traill/Grant/Steele	n/a	2	n/a	n/a
Williams	4,478	1	9	22
West Fargo	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Ward	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Ft. Totten	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Wahpeton	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
United Tribes	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

TABLE 8

HEARING IMPAIRED

UNIT OR DISTRICT REPORTED

Unit	Enrollment 1 - 12	Students Served	Reported Expected Incidence	National Expected Incidence 0.5%
Cass/Fargo	2,417	9	236	12
Barnes	3,050	4	6	15
Benson/Eddy/Foster/Wells/Sheridan	5,613	0	112	28
Bottineau/Rolette/Renville	4,567	17	90	23
Belcourt	1,601	0	12	8
Bismarck	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Burleigh	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Divide/Mountrail/Burke	3,262	1	66	16
Dickey	1,511	n/a	n/a	8
Grand Forks Rural/Walsh	5,222	26	104	26
Grand Forks (City)	9,400	2	8	47
Kidder/McIntosh/Logan	n/a	1	8	n/a
Emmons	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Pembina	2,700	10	57	14
LaMoure	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Lake Region	7,944	n/a	n/a	40
McHenry/Pierce	3,576	2	n/a	18
Morton	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mandan	n/a	n/a	5	n/a
New Salem	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Adams/Bowman/Slope	n/a	3	92	n/a
Hebron	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
McLean	2,894	n/a	n/a	14
Mercer/Oliver	2,000	17	40	10
Richland/Ransom/Sargent	6,570	n/a	n/a	33
Stark/Dunn/Golden Valley/Billings	8,590	5	172	43
Stutsman	4,725	1	6	24
Sioux	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Traill/Grant/Steele	n/a	1	n/a	n/a
Williams	4,478	5	89	22
West Fargo	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Ward	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Ft. Totten	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Wahpeton	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
United Tribes	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

TABLE 9

VISUALLY IMPAIRED

UNIT OR DISTRICT REPORTED

Unit	Enrollment 1 - 12	Students Served	Reported Expected Incidence	National Expected Incidence 0.1%
Cass/Fargo	2,417	9	9	2
Barnes	3,050	3	5	3
Benson/Eddy/Foster/Wells/Sheridan	5,613	0	3	6
Bottineau/Rolette/Renville	4,567	0	27	5
Belcourt	1,601	0	4	2
Bismarck	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Burleigh	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Divide/Mountrail/Burke	3,262	2	2	3
Dickey	1,511	0	0	2
Grand Forks Rural/Walsh	5,222	2	4	5
Grand Forks (City)	9,400	0	5	9
Kidder/McIntosh/Logan	n/a	n/a	1	n/a
Emmons	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Pembina	2,700	0	2	3
LaMoure	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Lake Region	7,944	0	15	8
McHenry/Pierce	3,576	1	7	4
Morton	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mandan	n/a	n/a	1	n/a
New Salem	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Adams/Bowman/Slope	n/a	n/a	3	n/a
Hebron	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
McLean	2,894	0	6	3
Mercer/Oliver	2,000	0	16	2
Richland/Ransom/Sargent	6,570	4	2	7
Stark/Dunn/Golden Valley/Billings	8,590	2	5	9
Stutsman	4,725	1	1	5
Sioux	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Traill/Grant/Steele	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Williams	4,478	3	3	4
West Fargo	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Ward	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Ft. Totten	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Wahpeton	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
United Tribes	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

ANALYSIS OF A.F.D.C. INCIDENCES

Material gathered from the Title I Office in Bismarck provided the data for this analysis. The material was complete except for the omission of Ward County and four schools in Wells County.

The rationale for using Aid for Dependent Children (AFDC) students to determine Title I payments was explained in a letter dated September 1, 1977, from Warren G. Borchert, North Dakota Director of Title I:

> The AFDC children were originally included in the Title I formula as a means of updating the Title I count between the 10-year census of families in poverty. When the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was first enacted, states and school districts were entitled to grants based on the number of children from families with incomes below $2,000, plus children from families that received more than $2,000 in AFDC payments. Inclusion of AFDC in the formula was pushed by congressional members from large cities as a help to urban areas that made larger AFDC payments. That was, in fact, the way it worked out; by the time Congress looked at the Title I formula again in 1974, the number of AFDC children counted for Title I purposes had grown from 10 percent of the total count in 1966 to 60 percent in 1974, with wealthy states such as New York, Connecticut and Illinois getting more Title I dollars as a result of their AFDC payments. In 1974, Congress adopted the present formula, which provides that only two-thirds of AFDC children whose families have incomes above the Orshansky level are to be included in the Title I count.

The data presented in this analysis are the actual number of AFDC students reported before the two-thirds figure was applied for Title I purposes. This figure represents those students whose parents or guardians received enough AFDC aid to qualify them for Title I purposes.

The data indicated that North Dakota had 727 AFDC students qualified on these criteria during the 1976-77 school year. The North Dakota Department of Public Instruction indicated that there were 139,656 students during the same school year. This means that there was one AFDC student for each 192 students enrolled during the 1976-77 school year. The table at the conclusion of this section indicates the number of AFDC students in each school where at least one AFDC student was indicated and the number of AFDC students that could have been expected based on the state average. (Enrollment was divided by the average state incidence.)

It is difficult to judge how many AFDC students constitute an unusual burden. However, if one makes the assumptions that, (1) more than an average of one student per grade is necessary and (2) an incidence of higher than one AFDC student per 192 students is also necessary--that is, higher than the state average--then only seven districts qualify for consideration as evidencing an unusual burden.

Williston, with 19 AFDC students and a total enrollment of 2,762, has an average of one AFDC student for each 145 students. This burden, while relatively high, seems less than overwhelming. Six other schools indicated a much larger relative burden:

School	Enrollment	AFDC	Incidence
New Town	702	31	1 in 23
Devils Lake	1,988	29	1 in 69
Dunseith	578	79	1 in 7
St. John	288	15	1 in 19
Couture	1,002	105	1 in 10
Ingebretson	182	46	1 in 4

Two of the six schools reflecting a significant burden are BIA schools and the other four have a high percentage of Native American students. It may well be that the problem can better be addressed by aid to Native American students than to AFDC students. The six schools that do have the higher incidences account for 42 percent of the AFDC students in North Dakota.

TABLE 1

A.F.D.C. STUDENTS 1976-77*

School	Enrollment	AFDC	Expected AFDC
North Central	303	5	2
Litchville	261	5	1
Minnewauken	209	6	1
Ft. Totten	213	10	1
Warwick	178	7	1
Kindred	600	5	3
Fullerton	73	6	0
Halliday	210	5	1
Twin Buttes	---	9	—
Tuttle	132	6	1
White Shield	163	9	1
Beulah	515	6	3
New Town	702	31	4
Parshall	364	7	2
Devils Lake	1,988	29	10
Dunseith	578	79	3
St. John	288	15	1
Mount Pleasant	489	10	2
Couture	1,002	105	5
Ingebretson	182	46	1
Solen	332	9	2
Ft. Yates	665	5	3
Selfridge	146	5	1
Streeter	163	6	1
Cando	507	7	3
Williston	2,762	19	14
Bismarck	8,750	38	44
Fargo	9,794	28	49
Grand Forks	10,052	22	52
Dickinson	2,511	10	13
Jamestown	3,219	7	16
Bottineau	936	1	5
West Fargo	3,046	3	15
Langdon	1,172	2	6
Mandan	3,088	4	15
Rugby	1,158	4	6

*Qualifying under criteria employed for Title I eligibility